THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCXIII.] SEPTEMBER, 1862. [Vol. XVIII.

NONCONFORMITY, 1662.

A Lecture delivered in Cross-Street Chapel, Manchester, May 28, 1862.

BY REV. CHARLES BEARD, B.A.

[We have asked, for the benefit of our readers, the opportunity of printing the lecture which follows, and which will, from its subject, better precede than follow the lectures of Rev. J. J. Tayler and Rev. Charles Wicksteed, which will appear in future numbers of our present volume.—Ed. C. R.]

The 29th of May, 1660, was a day on which the English nation, usually not prone to sentimental excess, seemed to have thrown to the winds all its ancient gravity and reserve, and to have abandoned itself to transports of joy, with which later generations find it hard to sympathize. Flags fluttered in the wind, bonfires blazed on every hill, crowds, by turns laughing and weeping, lined London streets, and all national hope might be judged to have culminated in fruition at the time when the King, escorted by a gay and noble cavalcade, slowly passed westward to Whitehall. The burden of the old cavalier song, "The King shall enjoy his own again," was now accepted as a faithful word of prophecy even by Puritan London; and the fact that a careless and dissolute youth was about to ascend the throne of his father and grandfather was enough to blot out for a time the remembrance of Grand Remonstrance, Petition of Right, Abolition of Star Chamber, and a thousand victories more, which a people earnestly desirous of righteous self-government had won in council-chamber and battle-field over crowned and coroneted and mitred tyranny. "Why have I miserably loitered so long in Holland," Charles is reported to have said, "if this good people are all of one mind to have me for their King?" Cromwell's old soldiers stood sullenly aside as he passed their lines upon Blackheath; but with that one exception, the nation's shout seemed to issue from a single throat. Perhaps the tragedy which had been played out that dim January morning eleven years ago behind Whitehall, still weighed upon the general conscience; and in the King's welcome home again there was an element of recompence and restitution. Cavaliers whose estates had been confiscated, whose social rank had been usurped by upstart Roundheads, whose old houses had been battered about

their ears in civil war, who had wounds to shew and loss of kinsmen to recount, and an unstained purity of loyal suffering to boast of, and whose signal failure was now to be unexpectedly turned into glittering success, naturally welcomed the triumph of their religion, their party, their king. Presbyterianism had never been fanatically disloyal; did not see, with James I., the absolute and necessary connection between kings and bishops; was not opposed to a National Church and Liturgy, if only it had itself something to do with the ordering of them; moreover, had been hindered by Cromwell's strong hand from remodelling English religion after its own fashion, and so was not hopeless of making better terms with his successor. Perhaps London tradesmen were glad to have a gay and costly court once more at their doors; and an affable young king, too thoughtlessly goodnatured to care for dignity, fondling his spaniels and feeding his ducks in full view of an admiring public, had more of the elements of street popularity in him than a stern old Protector, believing that government was a gift of the Spirit, and bidding English cannon roar in hearing of Italy and Spain on behalf of God's afflicted people. But *he* had passed away one stormy night eighteen months before; the son could not sit in the father's seat; the kingdom was fast becoming a prey to whichever brutal general should prove himself wariest and strongest; better the King than that! So the King came, and the whole sad farce (farce of which the Church of England has in these last months grown ashamed, and blotted out the commemoration thereof from the Prayer-book) reached its highest point, when, "as he passed along, old Mr. Arthur Jackson, an eminent Presbyterian minister, presented his Majesty with a rich embossed Bible, which he was pleased to receive, and to declare it his resolution to make that book the rule of his conduct."*

How far that resolution was kept, let the scandalous chronicles of the most scandalous period of English history testify. Charles the Second, who was thirty years of age on the very day of his triumphal entry into London, had learned from the troubles of his father's reign, from his wearisome royalty in Scotland, from perils and hairbreadth 'scapes after Worcester fight, from the undignified privations of his ten years' exile, only one lesson. His father, from a persistent adherence to what he thought truth and right, had died upon the scaffold: come what would, he was resolved to die in his bed. From the very moment of his return, he was the creature of what seemed to him the strongest party in the State. Perhaps he thought the Church of England more the religion of a gentleman than Presbyterianism, which offended his taste and rebuked his pleasures; but then he found the Church of Rome more gentlemanly and more accommodating than either. For persecution, he had not the common excuse of

* Neal, IV. 258.

a fanatical devotion to truth; if the Presbyterians had been uppermost in the nation's esteem and love, he would have proscribed bishops and passed Five-Mile Acts against Sanderson, and Walton, and Pearson and South, just as easily as he silenced Henry and imprisoned Baxter. He believed in one thing only: not in truth, nor in duty, nor in purity, nor in self-denial, not even in retribution now, or judgment soon to come; but in the lust of the flesh and the pride of life. Give him these and he was content: though Dutch fleets moored in the Medway; though English policy was directed from Versailles; though London rotted in the Plague or lay in ashes from the Fire; though Cavaliers begged their bread and Nonconformists starved in prison; though Oates lied innocent Catholic lives away, and Sidney and Russell died martyrs' deaths for liberty. Through all he laughed and jested and lived a beast's life, and bowed his head to every storm; what were truth and justice and religion and innocent lives to him, so he 'scaped his father's scaffold and died a king! A certain careless courtesy and goodnature made up for much; a monarch profuse of promises, whom all men could speak to in Park or on the Mall; whose ready sympathies exhaled in petty help of present needs; not himself cruel or violent or tyrannical, though too indolent by far to prevent others from being all this in his name;—who could think ill of him? A perfect gentleman, with the slight drawbacks of being unfaithful to his wife, untrue to his promises, reckless in his pleasures, careless of royal duty, and not altogether discerning whether there be in the world such things as right and wrong. A King in whose days the Church sounded the lowest depths of irreligion and servility; English honour was flouted on every sea; English liberty was trampled under foot without complaint; English literature contracted stains of unutterable filth; the national exchequer was bankrupt, and conscience and piety lay silently in gaol!

Charles had been brought home without conditions, political or religious, yet by no means without promises. When Lords and Commons sent a deputation to him, yet in exile at Breda, six of the London ministers went with it, and were received (the prize not being yet wholly within his grasp) with many kind words and specious courtesies. Notably too, in that famous Declaration of Breda, dated in April of this same year 1660, Charles had solemnly published these words, risking his possible royalty, as it were, upon the throw: "We do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom." So, as soon as he arrived in England, a further pledge of concord was given by the appointment of ten Presbyterian divines to be his chaplains in ordinary, of whom no more than four, Reynolds, Spurstow, Calamy and Baxter, had

each preached once in the exercise of his office, when the bubble burst. All (at least in outer seeming) looked well for the reunion of the English Church. There was to be a conference between eminent men of either party to dispose of matters in dispute; the King thought that "by abating something on both sides and meeting in the midway," some agreement might be come to. Still one who could read the signs of the times might have discerned a little cloud, at first no bigger than a man's hand, yet slowly gathering strength, and surely creeping up the sky. First the House of Lords, next the House of Commons, then many of the parochial clergy, silently, yet without hindrance, restored the Prayer-book to its place in public worship. Sequestered rectors and curates took possession of their old livings, including many who had been removed, not for political, but for moral reasons. At Oxford, eight, at Cambridge, six Heads of houses took the place of as many Puritan divines who had once been installed in their room; and the precedent was followed in regard to fellowships, professorships and other minor offices of honour and profit. Though the Presbyterians were still hugging the belief that episcopacy was an open question, vacant bishoprics were filled up, with some reservation, as we shall presently hear, of one or two sees for eminent Presbyterian divines, if by this bribe they could be persuaded to conform. It was very plain, in more ways than one, that a gradual return was being made to the old system; and that while the sects were being amused with negociations and promises, the Church was gathering up her strength for a last and decisive conflict.

The King's new chaplains employed their privilege of access to his person to obtain permission to draw up proposals of union, which were duly considered and settled, carefully answered by a committee of bishops, and cannot be further characterized in this place than as moderate, conciliatory and tending to the advantage of practical religion. The upshot of them was a meeting which took place at the house of Lord Chancellor Clarendon, on the 22nd of October, between the King, certain well-known courtiers, seven bishops, and as many Presbyterian divines. A declaration, drawn up in the King's name, was there read and agreed to. It promised a wise, gentle and godly government of the Church. It modified episcopacy by some admixture of Presbyterian discipline. It announced an intended revision of the Liturgy, and meanwhile gave liberty in the use of it. It indulged tender consciences in regard to obnoxious ceremonies; and, last of all, it emphatically repeated the words of the Declaration of Breda in respect to liberty of worship. Lords and Commons joined to wait upon the King and to thank him for this happy settlement of differences; the London ministers presented a grateful address; nay, Dr. Reynolds, a noted

divine of the Presbyterian party, accepted upon these terms the Bishopric of Norwich, while Baxter, more scrupulous, refused that of Hereford,—Calamy, Lichfield and Coventry. Other less notable preferments were offered to smaller men, nor, for a time, altogether refused; at one moment, it almost seemed as if the Church had found the charm which was to heal all her wounds and restore her to more than her former strength and beauty.

Historians tell us that this settlement failed because the House of Commons, having thanked the King for his declaration, refused to pass the second reading of the Bill which was to give it the force of law, not altogether without suspicion of court connivance. I venture to think, after the lapse of 200 years, that it is possible to find a deeper and truer reason; one which puts us upon the track of providential methods and activities. In the conference at Clarendon's house, the Chancellor had proposed the insertion in the declaration of a clause, which, ostensibly in favour of the Independents and Baptists, would have had the effect of securing liberty of worship to the Catholics. Whereupon Baxter, assuredly not the least liberal of his party, replied, "that they desired not favour to themselves alone, and rigorous severity against none; but as they humbly thanked his Majesty for his declared indulgence to themselves, so they distinguished the tolerable party from the intolerable; for the former, they humbly craved just lenity and favour; for the latter, Papists and Socinians, they could not make a toleration their request." I suppose that if English Presbyterians have had any work to do in the world, it has been first to learn and then to teach the lesson of perfect religious liberty. Baxter's words, learned and wise and large-hearted though he be, shew that they do not yet understand the lesson: God's will is that they should go forth into the desert and learn it.

So the winter wore away. When spring returned, Charles was first crowned, then married, being about to fulfil the oaths and vows taken on these several occasions with a like impartial faithlessness. A new Parliament was summoned and met in May, fervid with loyalty, and ready, right or wrong, to do the King's pleasure. A foolish insurrection of Fifth-monarchy men, an absurd story of a Presbyterian plot, were pretexts for harsher speech from the King; Members of Parliament, willing to bask in the sunshine of Royal favour, found it not difficult to choose a side. The Houses began by voting that on a certain day all their members should receive the Sacrament according to the forms of the Church of England; then ordered the Solemn League and Covenant to be burned by the hands of the common hangman; next, after due interval of a few months, proceeded to pass a Bill of infamous notoriety, even in our own day, under the name of the "Corporation Act," which, by various pro-

visions, carefully shut out all but abject loyalists and members of the Episcopal Church from municipal office, and therefore, in many cases, from parliamentary influence. Meanwhile, the Royal Commission for the revision of the Liturgy had been issued, on the one hand to archbishops and bishops, on the other to certain learned and able divines of the Presbyterian party. Whoso desires to read the weary story of this Savoy Conference (so called from its place of meeting) may find it in the Autobiography of Richard Baxter, himself a prominent actor in the same: it is not for us to wade to-night through such weedy floods of ineffectual talk. Pearson (he whose Exposition of the Creed is still a University text-book; after this, Bishop of Chester) and Gunning, who has gone his way unregretted into blank forgetfulness, were the chief disputants on one side; Baxter and Bates on the other. The parties did not meet on equal terms, as one at least had hoped; the bishops looked down upon the ministers from an infinite ecclesiastical height, asked them in so many words what they came there for and what exceptions to the Prayer-book they had to bring, carelessly discussed the matter through some weeks, and at last brought the Conference to a close, yielding not an inch. They had come to the discussion resolved, with help and support of the King, to do nothing; and, with much insolence and insincerity, did it.

The work of revising the Liturgy was now transferred from the Savoy Conference to Convocation, from which, as far as possible, all Presbyterian delegates had been excluded. There it went bravely on. Alterations there were in plenty; a word omitted here, a clause inserted there; now an old rubric restored; then a new occasional service added. But of alterations such as the Presbyterians asked for—not one; much rather amendments in an anti-Presbyterian sense. A few more saints' days imposed upon those who objected to saints' days at all; scruples as to the use of the Apocrypha met by ordering "Bel and the Dragon" to be read in churches;—this was the spirit of episcopal legislation. The surplice, the use of the cross in baptism, of the kneeling attitude at the Lord's Supper,—all these things, which, however apparently trifling to us, were real difficulties to the consciences of our fathers, were left unchanged. There was a possibility of keeping 2000 ministers, many of them learned, most of them pious, all of them conscientious men, within the pale of the Church, and the Church wilfully cast them out. Said Sheldon, then Bishop of London, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, when the Earl of Manchester remarked, "that he was afraid the terms of conformity were so hard that many ministers would not comply,"—that *he* was afraid they would, "but now we know their minds we will make them all knaves if they conform:" and again, in answer to another remark, "Pity the door is so strait,"—"No pity at all; if we had thought so many

of them would have conformed, we would have made it straiter." I know of no words of justice and kindness on that side which it would be fair to balance against this outbreak of triumphant bigotry.

The Prayer-book thus revised, all was ready for the passing of the Act of Uniformity. The King threw off the mask which he had more or less loosely worn since the Declaration of Breda, and declared himself an earnest friend of the Church of England. Both before and after this time the Stuarts shewed that they knew how to make their own declarations valid against Acts of Parliament; now, for once, Charles appealed to an Act of Parliament to free him from the fetters of his declaration. The Bill was read in the House of Commons a first time on the 14th of January, 1662, and finally received the Royal assent on the 19th of May following. Its course was not always accompanied by a prosperous breeze: on one division it escaped rejection only by six votes, in a house of 366 members. More than once the Lords strove to mitigate the severity of its provisions, but the Commons, backed by the Court and the clergy, insisted upon and carried every particular. It needs hardly to say that the Act was to come into operation three months after receiving the Royal assent, on the Feast of St. Bartholomew next ensuing, the 24th of August, 1662.

I shall probably succeed in setting the provisions of this celebrated Act in the clearest light if, abandoning legal technicalities, I simply enumerate the difficulties which it threw in the way of a conscientious Presbyterian minister, anxious, if he could, to retain his place in the Church. It prescribed that he should use henceforth in public worship the form of Common Prayer now amended, and forbade the use of any other form. Beyond this, he was required to declare, "openly and publicly, before the congregation assembled for religious worship, his unfeigned assent and consent to all things contained and prescribed in and by the said book," making use for that purpose of a fixed form of words. All cathedral clergy, all university dignitaries and officials, all parish priests of whatever degree, all teachers, from professors at Oxford down to village schoolmasters and private tutors, are required to make a second declaration,—first, "that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take arms against the King;" next, promising to conform "to the Liturgy of the Church of England as now by law established;" and, in the last place, "abjuring the Solemn League and Covenant." Then all ministers, not heretofore episcopally ordained, are enjoined to seek the same, on pain of forfeiting £100 for every ministerial act committed while still without such ordination. This was what a Presbyterian minister had to make up his mind to before St. Bartholomew's-day;—deprivation, perhaps beggary, staring him in the face else. Convocation had made no

fewer than six hundred petty alterations in the Prayer-book; into many parishes not a single copy of the amended Liturgy had found its way, when the fatal day came; still no help, starvation or blind conformity the only choice! Some of these men had in their day sworn to the Solemn League and Covenant, and, in the honesty of their hearts, believed it to be a great national compact not unblessed of God; shall their yea now be nay; their nay, yea? From August, 1642, when the King's standard was first set up at Nottingham, to August, 1662, is but twenty years; are men who had bidden God-speed to the efforts of Pym and Hampden, even of Clarendon himself in his better days, men who had kept godly watch in Cromwell's army, and stood stoutly behind the walls of Gloucester, and helped to raise the psalm of onset at Naseby and Marston Moor and Worcester,—are these men to belie themselves, and subscribe the slavish doctrine that oppressed subjects may never try the issue of battle with a tyrannical and perjured King? Or shall a man like Richard Baxter, who, unhelped by any university, had made himself a miracle of abstruse learning,—who, like the apostle Paul, could appeal to the richest and most abundant fruits of the Spirit growing in waste places as the proof of his commission,—who, whether Bishop of Hereford or prisoner in the Gatehouse, was necessarily a prophet and a king in religious England, not only of that, but of many following generations,—shall he humbly sue for ordination at the hands of a bishop (ordination not asked by those very bishops of Swiss or German Protestant), and confess by the suit that, for all his toils and prayers and triumphs, he has hitherto been no true minister of Christ? Truly said Bishop Sheldon that terms like these were intended to compel men into Nonconformity.

A volume of Farewell Sermons, preached in London on the 17th of August, 1662,—the Sunday, that is, before the ejectment,—has given me a clearer insight than I could have gained in any other way into the spirit in which the Presbyterian clergy met this great affliction. Nor is the scene itself difficult to recall. Think of one of the old London churches (not the dreary, dusty Palladian structures which now stand grimily in the busy streets), but a venerable Gothic pile, soon to be laid low by the Great Fire, but still rising rich in civic memories from a line of quaintly gabled houses almost as stately as itself. Note how it is crowded, nave and aisle and chancel, with eager listeners: staid citizens and their tearful wives, to whom this was a bitter day indeed; happy youths and maidens, intent chiefly on themselves, and full of hopes in which all the world's promise was shut up, yet startled and saddened for once into heedful reverence; little children, wondering why so many faces should be graver even than their wont, and the awe-struck company more still; perhaps, here and there, a gay courtier, come to listen to

what passionate appeal a great preacher might make, or some triumphant priest, already hungering for the benefice. There is a great silence as the minister threads his way through the crowded passages, and stands for the last time in his accustomed place; I can fancy a certain tremulousness in the psalm of praise, a deeper than a common insight into the significance of Scripture. The prayers uttered that day remain for us to read,—prayers which, while not forgetting (this Sunday of all Sundays) to invoke the Divine blessing on king and country, are yet full of the deepest sincerity of religious life, as if all thankfulness, all repentance, all supplication, were to be expressed in one passionate outbreak, and thenceforward to be silent evermore. And what a strange yet noble thing is the self-forgetfulness which breathes through all these sermons! It is little to say that they do not contain a word of controversy or of complaint; though surely this was a time when, if ever, a preacher might expatiate somewhat upon himself—when he was almost bound to explain to those who had so long waited on his ministry why he endured to be silenced and cast out. But the prevalent feeling among these worthy servants of Christ seems to have been far other than this. "There, before me," thought each one, "is the people committed to my charge—there, not yet wholly Christ's: one more precious opportunity is given to me of repairing my imperfect shepherding of souls: let me speak with all earnestness, while yet I may, of truth and righteousness and judgment to come!" So in many of these sermons there is no verbal allusion to the occasion: it is quite passed by, as a matter below the level of those great interests which should occupy the thoughts of a Christian teacher and his disciples: its presence can be detected only in the more condensed force of argument, the more persuasive energy of appeal, as if much were to be said *now* which could never be said again. In others, the remembrance of the day breaks out only in indirect allusion. When Calamy was preaching at St. Mary's, Aldermanbury, do you not think a thrill would go through the hearts of his people when he said—they interpreting his words to his own case and theirs—"It is sin that maketh straits deserve the name of straits: therefore you are spiritually mad that commit sin to avoid straits"? And again, speaking of the three children in Nebuchadnezzar's furnace—"I have often told you, when three are cast into the fire for a good conscience, God will make the fourth: therefore, I say, straits and sufferings for God are not worth the name of straits." What a quaint, homely pathos is there in the few words in which Caryl, preaching at St. Magnus of the worthy ones that should walk in white, alludes to the grief that filled his hearers' hearts and his own: "I would only say this to you, that as I have from this text and many more laboured to bring poor souls into a white state, to a state of

justification, to a state of holiness, and as I have been pressing you to keep your garments white, that you may be in the habit of white as your reward; so it shall be the desire and prayers of my heart, that if I should have no more opportunities among you, that as you have been stirred up to get into this white of grace, that you and I may meet in the white of glory, where we shall never part." Others, again, thought fit to add to the end of their sermons a word of farewell; yet even so of the briefest and simplest. Said Dr. Bates, at that church of St. Dunstan's which still rears its venerable front over the roar of Temple Bar: "I know you expect I should say something as to my nonconformity. I shall only say thus much: it is neither fancy, faction or humour, that makes me not to comply, but merely for fear of offending God. And if after the best means used for my illumination, as prayer to God, discourse, study, I am not able to be satisfied concerning the lawfulness of what is required; if it be my unhappiness to be in error, surely men will have no reason to be angry with me in this world, and I hope God will pardon me in the next." And still more touchingly, Mr. Lye, at All-Hallows, Lombard Street: "Brethren, I could do very much for the love I bear to you, but I dare not sin. I know they will tell you this is pride and peevishness in us, and that we have preached against it, and are tender of our reputation, and we would fain all be bishops, and forty things more; but the Lord be witness between them and us in this. Beloved, I prefer my wife and children before a blast of air of people's talk; I am very sensible what it is to be reduced to a morsel of bread. Let the God of heaven and earth do what He will with me, if I could have subscribed with a good conscience, I would: I would do anything to keep myself in the work of God; but to sin against my God, I dare not do it." Likewise so said they all, and went out, not knowing whither they went,—Two Thousand honest men.

I am not about to enter into any discussion as to the precise number of the ejected; whether Calamy, in enumerating more than 2000, has fallen into the sin of exaggeration, a sin neither uncommon nor wholly unpardonable in professed martyrologists; or whether, on the other hand, his critics have not unjustly diminished the number of this noble army of confessors. Still less am I disposed to inquire whether the flower of the English Church is to be sought among those who retained or those who left their stations within her pale. Now at least, God be thanked, it is permitted us to love Taylor and Tillotson and Ken, without bating one jot of loyal attachment to Baxter and Howe and Alleine and Heywood. But if it is easy to count up a long bead-roll of famous names on either side, it is the peculiar glory of the Nonconformists that in their ranks can have been but a very small proportion of worldly and insincere and shallow-hearted

men. It is difficult to see what temptation there could have been for such to cast in their lot with the ejected. For conscience' sake, they had to cut themselves off from all visible communion with the nation's religious life, to own themselves, at least in sight of men, severed from the body of Christ. They had to abandon a work which God daily helped and blessed; believing that they had a commission from Him to speak, to be silent for the truth's sake; yearning over their people with a love hard to be expressed, to leave them to the ministry of strangers. They were called upon to exchange a comfortable maintenance for the providence of Him who feedeth the young ravens; or if this be never very hard for a true man who is alone in the world and is content to rely on God and his own right arm, many went forth, wife and children in hand, uncertain of to-morrow's bread. Whatever evil things they may have looked forward to on that dark August Sunday, came upon them, with many unexpected persecutions added: for years yet to come it will be a gainful trade to hunt down a Nonconformist; and the gaols will be full of those who fear the greater woe which will come upon them if they preach not the gospel. Many died in faith: before others stretch almost thirty years of alternate storm and calm, till at last the reward of much self-denying patience comes, not in a re-union with the Church from which they had been cut off, but in a sort of half-contemptuous permission to live out their obscure lives and preach their rude gospel untouched by penal law, yet with abnegation of all honours and acknowledged influence in Church and State. Many of the great self-sacrifices which history records have been more brilliant than this; not one, I think, so pure. For the sacrifice was very bitter and close at hand; the reward, hidden far away with God.

My account of the events which followed must be briefer than the narrative of those which preceded the Act of Uniformity. Fortunately, however perplexing in detail, the ecclesiastical policy of Charles II. and his successor was regulated by a regard to a single group of interests. Charles was a secret, James an avowed Catholic; and each was anxious to obtain at least a toleration for the worship of the ancient Church. But loyal as the Parliaments of this period were, they hated Catholicism even more than they loved monarchy, so that to obtain from them a *legal* indulgence for Papists was an altogether hopeless task. In this difficulty each King bethought him, in turns, of claiming and exercising the power of dispensing, by a mere effort of prerogative, with penal statutes in matters of religion; thus conferring a boon upon Nonconformists and Catholics at the same time, and attempting to play them off as an united party against the Church of England. The position was a perplexing one; the King offered liberty of conscience, the boon which Nonconformists desired above all others, yet offered it illegally; offered

it, by the same instrument, to men whom all Protestants agreed in regarding as intolerable; shewing, meanwhile, by his contented acquiescence in penal legislation, that indulgence to Catholicism was his real object, and toleration of Nonconformity only a blind behind which to accomplish this. So for the most part, in both reigns, the Dissenters (as they now began to be called) were deaf to the voice of temptation; availed themselves modestly and thankfully of indulgence without at any time approving or adopting the principle on which it was granted; concurred with Parliament and the Church, on all fitting occasions, in taking measures to secure the Protestantism of the realm and the due privileges of the people; notably stood fast to this self-denying policy in the great struggle of the Revolution; till, when the fight was over, and the Church of England was delivered from its last fear, intolerance once more re-asserted its rights, the wise and kindly counsels of Tillotson and Burnet and Somers were set aside, and, as I have already said, Nonconformists, who asked for comprehension, were fain to be content with toleration.

This long alternation of indulgence and persecution began almost as soon as the Act of Uniformity had been carried into effect. The Presbyterians, fully convinced that they had nothing to hope from Parliament, turned to the King, whose specious promises they had not yet learned to distrust, and whose facile good humour hid from them the hardness and coldness of his heart. So on the day after Christmas-day, in this same year 1662, he issued a declaration, again reciting the memorable words of Breda, modestly claiming the dispensing power, and promising a certain measure of indulgence to Nonconformists and Catholics. This gleam of hope was but of short duration. The House of Commons thanked his Majesty for his promise to maintain the Act of Uniformity, protested against the indulgence, and, by a seasonable supply of money to an always needy monarch, induced him for the time to abandon his intention. The winter and spring passed; some Nonconformist ministers were silent, even attended by times their parish churches as lay members of the Church of England; others preached, as occasion served, paying the penalty of their boldness in fine and imprisonment. The next blow was aimed at the laity, who ventured still to harbour, to support, to listen to, their old teachers. In 1663 was passed an Act, infamously known as the Conventicle Act, which provided that any person above sixteen years of age, who, after the 1st of July, 1664, was found "present at any meeting, under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion, in other manner than is allowed by the liturgy or practice of the Church of England, where shall be five or more persons than the household," shall for the first offence suffer three months' imprisonment, or pay a fine not exceeding £5; for the second offence, six months, or £10; for the third, seven years' transportation to

the American plantations, or £100. Justices of peace are empowered to break up all conventicles, and to take into custody as many of those present as they shall think fit. These heavy penalties are to be imposed, at the discretion of a single justice, upon the sole oath of the informer. And as if it were not enough thus to put the liberty of Nonconformist preachers and hearers into the hands of any ignorant and brutal country magistrate, without even the small protection afforded in those days by a jury, it was specially provided, by a malignant refinement of cruelty, that such convicts should not be shipped for New England or Virginia, plantations where free men worshiped the God of their fathers after the manner called heresy in England, and where the exiled Nonconformists, therefore, might have looked for sympathy and rest.

In the autumn of 1664, the spring of 1665, the Conventicle Act was put into vigorous operation, and the laity went to join their ministers in gaol. Then came the great Plague of London, when nearly 100,000 inhabitants of the city and its suburbs were swept away; and King and Parliament, affrighted, betook themselves to Oxford. Some of the clergy stood manfully to their posts in the stricken city, many more fled for their lives. But the place of the hirelings, whose own the sheep were not, was filled by the true shepherds; the Nonconformist ministers conceived that this at least was a time to disobey the law with a good conscience, and stood up in the empty pulpits with brave words of exhortation and comfort. All honour to Vincent, Janeway, Chester, Turner, and others like minded! But what shall we say of those who, from their safe retreat by the pleasant banks of Isis, could aim a last and deadly blow at these very men who were taking out at the chancery of heaven their certificate of apostleship? On the 31st of October, 1665, the Five-Mile Act received the Royal assent; compelling all Nonconformist ministers, not only to take the old oath as to the unlawfulness of taking up arms against the King under any pretext, but to swear "that they will not at any time endeavour any alteration of government either in Church or State;" in default of this, forbidding them to approach within five miles of any city, corporate town or borough, or even of any parish, town or place, where, before or since the Act of Uniformity, they have at any time exercised their ministry, and taking from them all liberty of private or public teaching. £40 is the penalty for this offence, one-third of which is to go to the informer; while any two justices of peace are authorized to commit any person, convicted of infringing the Act, to prison for six months, without bail. Some few ministers took the oath, conceiving that, in a certain sense, they might lawfully do so, and hoping thus to clear themselves from the charge of sedition. But most sorrowfully prepared to leave their homes, as once before they had abandoned

their churches. They had been partly dependent upon the neighbourly kindness of former hearers; now they were to take up their abode among strangers. Nonconformity was strongest then, as now, in the towns; this Act compelled the ministers to commit themselves, almost without resource, to the unsympathizing neighbourhood of a rude rural population. They had been wont to preach and pray in private families, going from house to house, and so evading the provisions of the Conventicle Act; now even this poor possibility of service was taken away. So they suffered silently; once more informers were busy, once more the gaols were full.

The fall of Clarendon, in December, 1665, was followed by an ineffectual attempt at toleration, not unsupported by the King, who, however, gave way at once to the fanatical bigotry of Parliament. Every negociation of this kind ended in a bargain; Charles sold the Nonconformists for a fresh supply of money to lavish on his infamous pleasures. While every such transaction is in progress, the vigour of persecution is relaxed; no sooner has it come to its natural conclusion, than the sheriffs swoop down upon some notorious conventicle, and lodge a well-known preacher in prison. Some years passed in this way, in which the only fact notable by us now, is the renewal of the Conventicle Act in 1670, with the addition of this truly comprehensive clause: "And be it further enacted, that all clauses in this Act shall be construed most largely and beneficially for the suppressing conventicles, and for the justification and encouragement of all persons to be employed in the execution thereof. No warrant or mittimus shall be made void, or reversed, for any default in the form; and if a person fly from one county or corporation to another, his goods and chattels shall be seizable wherever they are found." Then, in 1672, the King took heart of grace, and issued his declaration of indulgence—offering liberty of public worship, under certain restrictions and licences, to Nonconformists, of private worship to Roman Catholics,—a declaration which remained in force about a year, when Parliament met, and once more bought Nonconformists and Papists at the price of a subsidy. The Dissenters joined, to their honour be it said, in opposing the dispensing power, and were rewarded with promises of a legal toleration—promises conveniently broken when a Bill for that end was formally introduced into the House. Next, in 1673, came the Test Act, providing that no person shall be capable of occupying a place of trust under Government, unless he take the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England; a blow aimed, with the concurrence of Nonconformists, against the Catholics, and indeed driving the Duke of York from office, yet recoiling with fatal severity upon their own heads, and felt till long within living memory. But this was the last of the penal laws. From 1673 to 1685, when the King's death

proclaimed his long-concealed Catholicism, Nonconformity lived a troubled yet not altogether unprosperous life. Sometimes the laws were sternly executed; sometimes suffered to fall into temporary disuse. Men might preach and listen if they would, but at the mercy of any covetous or malicious informer who could find a magistrate willing to enforce the penalties. In London, especially, regular congregations were formed, some of them in the halls of the civic companies, consisting of grave and honourable citizens,—a class who, all through the 17th century, greatly affected the Puritan theology. "What are we to do?" said a sheriff of Middlesex at this time to Archbishop Sheldon, who reproached him for not executing the laws against Nonconformists; "we cannot trade with men to-day, and send them to prison to-morrow." So the churches enjoyed an uneasy and often broken repose, assuming daily a more individual form and organization, and ever parted by a wider gulf from the persecuting Church.

This, then, was the condition in which the stormy times of James II. found the Nonconformists. To the events of the Revolution of 1688, I have no intention of alluding to-night, farther than is necessary to make quite clear the nature of the final settlement. The King's policy was what his brother's had been, with this important difference, that his claim and exercise of the dispensing power were not covertly but openly directed to obtaining at least equality of religious privilege for Roman Catholic citizens. And you know how the Nonconformists, almost to a man, rejected the specious gift of liberty; how they preferred still to suffer rather than imperil the freedom of the nation by acknowledging so dangerous a prerogative in the Crown; how, in the hour of the Church's extremest need, they boldly stood by her and the cause of their common Protestantism. When William and Mary were firmly seated upon the throne, and the Bill of Rights was passed, and those liberties secured which since have

> broadened slowly down
> From precedent to precedent,

then, and not till then, they looked to have their wrongs redressed. They were not Dissenters yet; many, perhaps most of them, would not willingly be. They still wished to think it possible that English Christianity should be one in form and organization; they still wished to call their own the stately cathedrals, the venerable churches, where they had themselves once worshiped, and where their fathers lay waiting the resurrection of the just. But it was not so to be; the Church knew not the hour of her opportunity. The Act of Uniformity still continued to mark her boundaries. The Test and Corporation Acts were not repealed. There was no revision of the Liturgy. There was no modification of episcopal government. A Bill for comprehension was

introduced into Parliament, but quietly suffered to drop; the Toleration Act remains the sole memorial of what the Revolution did for religious liberty. Quakers are to be indulged upon making a declaration. Others who attend conventicles are required to take the oath of allegiance, and to subscribe the declaration against Popery. Ministers, in addition to this, must sign the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, with the exception of three and part of a fourth. Meeting-houses are to be registered, and congregations assembling in them to be legally protected from insult and interference. But no part of the above applies to Papists and Unitarians, still considered absolutely intolerable. This treaty of peace, all that could be extracted from a triumphant and ungrateful Church, would have been but an unsafe foundation for the religious liberties of Englishmen, had it not been wisely interpreted by the growing liberality of successive generations. To my mind, the date of its passing is the most melancholy epoch in English ecclesiastical history; for *then*, first, it was declared to be a natural and right thing that Christ's church in England should not be one, but many.

I seem to see in this long story (story, which I have tried to tell as briefly as I knew how, and which is indeed being still continued in our own life and work) an exemplification of the method of human progress. All truer thought, all purer life, necessarily finds its first expression in dissent. The man who discerns the possibility of a theory of the universe more accordant with irreversible fact than that commonly received, or he who is able to attune his own life to a finer harmony with eternal law, not only differs from his fellows, but is constrained to make the difference plain. If only he is convinced that Truth is no mere plaything of the speculative intellect, Right something better than a calculation of conflicting expediencies—both of them, indeed, firmly grounded in the very nature of the infinite God—he cannot be content to keep them locked up in his own heart. Whether he will or no, he is forced, to the extent of his new truth, to become a Nonconformist, to incur the sacrifices, to pay the penalty of Nonconformity. Moses in Egypt, Christ at Nazareth, Luther in his convent, Fox, as the crowds hooted him in the market-places, Wesley, when his church turned her back upon him,—these, and countless other sons of God, have been made to feel the bitterness at once and the stern joy of being severed from the communion of men, yet admitted into solitary fellowship with the Father. Not merely as an expression of human ingratitude is it true that the Cross surely waits for the greatest benefactors of our race; it is a necessary law of our common life that one must pay the price for the uplifting of many, and the material instrument of our Lord's last trial has become the symbol by which we signify an

universal fact. But then true Nonconformity is not willing to perpetuate itself. The prophet departs into the wilderness, not that he may there hopelessly and alone wander among the rocks, but that through the craggy pass and over the shifting sands he may lead the people into a land "flowing with milk and honey." First a few faithful ones hear his voice and venture timidly to follow in his footsteps; then others gather courage, and then a host; the faint-hearted are made bold, the careless quickened by the great shock of sympathy that runs the nation through, till presently the Lord's people have been delivered from Egypt, and are manfully working out their own salvation. From age to age this process is repeated: Nonconformity dies only to be born again; the world would stand still if it were not so. But the prophet departs only that the people may follow him: Christ hangs upon the cross that all men may be lifted up. And so true Nonconformists make their sorrowful protest against error, in the sure hope that they shall one day be able to re-unite with the brethren whom they have left behind, in a common agreement in the truth.

Thus, I cannot look at the great event which I have too feebly endeavoured to narrate to-night in the light of any special doctrine or transitory interest. I do not hold it up as a triumph of Dissent, for the Two Thousand were not willing Dissenters, nor am I. Still less do I make it ground of accusation against the Church; there are few Churches but have persecuted in their day, and according to the fashion of their day; "let the dead past bury its dead." I have no wish to resuscitate the specific controversies which gave occasion to this signal faithfulness; in rites and ceremonies we have little interest, in doctrine we have penetrated to a region whence we hear but faintly the clash of Arminian and Calvinist controversy. I shall not attempt to point the moral of 1662 to the Church of England of to-day; I cannot enter into the consciences of men, many of whom are worthier servants of Christ than I, to judge, to approve, to condemn; to their own Master they stand or fall. No! here is a great fact,—to me, at least, by far too noble and too sacred to be degraded to any uses of temporary or sectarian controversy. Two Thousand men, who, with every hindrance in the way of their seeing it, have yet seen that of all things a lie is the emptiest and most unprofitable thing in God's universe, and at whatever cost, of substance, of usefulness, of existence even, are determined to keep their lives clear of falsehood! Not all learned, not all refined, perhaps in other respects not all faithful; but all honest, and all resolved by God's grace to keep so. Ministers of God, who have fully apprehended at least this doctrine, that God is Truth, and can be acceptably served only by true men,—servants of Christ, who, like their Master, cannot in the least jot or tittle deny or conceal the

thing that is, though the Cross visibly wait upon the Hill of Agony! Brethren, if you only knew how hard it is for those who speak as we do, to speak the whole naked truth, even at the cost of such petty penalties as may still await those who enjoy our freedom; how difficult to free ourselves from old prepossessions; how strong the temptation to say sometimes what you will gladly hear; how all but impossible to maintain a just independence of other minds, and to bare our own souls to your view,—you would wonder with me at the fortitude of these Two Thousand men, who, with one accord, wrenched a visible lie from their lives and went out into darkness and the shadow of death.

By many, the ejection of the Two Thousand will be regarded as having come to its natural end in the Revolution settlement, and, if so regarded, must be adjudged a failure. The prophet went out, and the people did *not* follow him; the protest was uttered against the Church's narrowness, and the Church remains narrow as before. And truly if I had no hope for the future, I should be compelled to utter the same melancholy verdict; for the condition of English Christianity, a condition which at the Revolution first took recognized and legal shape, is to me, as to all observers among foreign churches, a scandal and a wrong, which are all the greater in so far as they are unknown to those who suffer under them. That divisions, multiplied from year to year at the will of any self-willed leader, should be allowed as justifiable if only founded on some microscopic difference in our poor human apprehensions of an infinite and many-sided truth,—and not merely allowed as justifiable, but, with all their attendant suspicions and rivalries and envyings and heart-burnings, looked upon as a necessary and perpetual condition of the Church,—is to me a sorrow which I pass almost silently by, in the hope that in a better day it will wring other men's hearts and so work out its own consolation. But I do not look upon the existence of so many triumphant Dissenting bodies, side by side with the Church, as in any sense a true or legitimate result of the self-sacrifice of 1662. That result I find in the long and obscure history of a number of churches, who in these latter days have wandered far from the theological position of their founders, the victims of the Act of Uniformity. To them men say, "You occupy the chapels, you enjoy the endowments of old Dissent, yet are no true sons of your forefathers,—much more their shame and their reproach; give place to us who maintain the whole truth unimpaired, and stand, as well as we may, where they stood." And the answer to such demand should ring clearly and boldly from our lips, that *our* fathers were men who would not have their sons stand still, and that we never are so truly their children as when we press eagerly on whithersoever truth and duty seem to lead.

For when, after much tribulation, the ejected of 1662 had entered into their earthly kingdom of God, they learned that "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." They gathered themselves together round the old teachers; they built their humble meeting-houses; they poured their substance into the common store; they provided for the education of future ministers; but, doing all this in strict accordance with their own views of truth and right, they left coming generations to God and their consciences. They were content that the Spirit of God should mould men's hearts and convictions in all future ages as it would: who were they that they should haply strive against it? And so long years passed,—years, to many worthy servants of Christ, of obscure self-sacrifice,—years which some stigmatize as a time of declining orthodoxy, and waning piety, and a growing listlessness in the more visible labours of the church. I am not here to accuse or to defend our fathers in the flesh and in the spirit: perhaps, after all, if they did not see our truths as clearly as we, there were truths of their own, even more necessary in that day, which they by no means failed to discern and to lay hold of. One thing I know, that our very ability to grasp the doctrines which we prize so highly and to which we cling in spite of the unanimous censure of Christendom,—the free and open heart with which we address ourselves to the good works now pressing upon our consciences,—are ours by direct inheritance, and are, if we use them rightly, a very sufficient product of two hundred years' Nonconformity. Now, for the first time, has the idea taken root in men's minds, of a theology which should make Truth the sole object of its belief and search, of a Church to be built on no less broad a base than the universal brotherhood of men.—Dreams, dreams, you say: let us gird our loins to perform to-day's duty, and be content. Ay, and so was the kingdom of God a dream when Christ rose from out the waters of baptism, and addressed himself to the altogether impracticable work of saving the whole world! My friends, it is part of God's moral government of the universe that the whole is firmly compacted with every part; that past, and present, and future, are one; that small and great are linked together by a tie that cannot be broken; and that the least and most transitory duty cannot be performed except in accordance with universal and eternal principles of right. And so it rests with us, and others like us (I say it in no spirit of self-congratulation—nay, if I know myself, I speak from beneath the burden of a too awful responsibility), whether yet the Nonconformity of 1662 shall bear its natural fruits or no. It may die, blighted by the coldness of our hearts; it may live, to lift England nearer God.

SOME FURTHER PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF THE LATE THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, B.D., F.S.A., &c.

I HAD come home for the Midsummer holidays to my father's house at Pentonville,—then a *ville* of some rural pretensions, being actually separated by fields from London,—when, on a sunny Sunday afternoon, this gentleman was first seen, seated in our front parlour, by the rather observant lad, since grown grey, who pens these supplementary reminiscences. He might then be about twenty-two years of age, and I some ten or eleven years younger. At first sight I was considerably struck with him. Most men in genteel life had already begun to wear the now nearly universal black; but Mr. Horne was habited in a lightish brown coat and nankeen trousers that have never faded from my remembrance. When he was gone, he became the subject of remarks in our family circle, from which I gathered that the visit resulted from his having become acquainted with some relatives of ours on my mother's side who resided at Lambeth; also that he was a very estimable person, though, from his bookish habits and small knowledge of general society, somewhat of what is called "a character." Little did any one present imagine that this same "peculiar" young man would one day become the justly eminent *littérateur*, and both in attainments and look the first-class clergyman, that everybody subsequently acknowledged him to be.

On leaving school, I became, for reasons needless to be particularized, a frequent visitor and guest at Lambeth; and soon found Mr. Horne regularly installed in what is called in the current number of the *Christian Reformer* "his humble cottage," but which was really what the builders designate a *lean-to* to our relatives' residence, consisting of a single room, tiled over, with a window looking upon the thoroughfare in front, and two at the side towards the garden. Of this at that time both comfortable and pleasant apartment (houses and streets built all around have since made a melancholy change in every feature of the spot) our respected friend made a dormitory and library. He was away all day, but generally presented himself to the family in the evening, a door opening from his domicile into their hall, and they being always happy to receive him. Of course the room was equally accessible from their side, and I was once or twice mysteriously conducted to it by an erewhile playmate of the opposite sex, who would laughingly tell me not to touch a book, for "Mr. Horne would be sure to know it." Notwithstanding this injunction, I transgressed, I fear, on each occasion, and was rewarded in the evening by a knowing look, accompanying the intimation that "somebody" had been at the books. There was a goodly number on the shelves; and their owner, I found, gave every otherwise unoccupied minute to the

perusal of them, carrying one at least with him every morning when he left home, and reading as he went all the way to Mr. Butterworth's in Fleet Street, where he was then employed. He had long practised this mode of study, and had become such an adept in it that I have heard him say he had read metaphysics in Cheapside. About this time he became superintendent of the Lambeth Methodist Sunday-school; and I had many opportunities of witnessing the indefatigable spirit with which, wearied as he must have been with his week-day labours, he conducted it. Our relative, the head of the family, was an earnest Wesleyan, and a more than commonly good man; and I have no doubt that Mr. Horne owed some of his strongest religious impressions to his connection with him. I passed most of my Sundays in their united society, and that of the other members of this truly pious circle; and it would have been strange had the effect upon myself not been what it actually was, that of making me, as I believed, a confirmed Wesleyan; so hidden from me then was the result of future inquiry and reflection. I should add that Mr. Horne's practical good sense was of considerable service to me at this period, by the distinctions it enabled him to draw, on various occasions, between rational piety and religious enthusiasm; to the latter of which the Methodists of that day, if not of the present, were certainly too much given. It was their own fault if the young men preparing for the ministry, whom our host took his turn in entertaining by twos at his house, did not receive similar benefit.

All the while Mr. Horne resided at Lambeth, he employed great part of the night in writing for the booksellers; an occupation requiring the combined ability and industry necessary to compiling, editing, reviewing, translating, indexing, &c., as the bibliopole's wants or speculative tendencies might lead him to shape his *order*. Whatever may be the case now, this was then a most sorry trade, in a pecuniary point of view, to those who engaged in it; and Mr. Horne never scrupled to confess that he had found it so. Singular as it may sound to such as never knew him until after he had commenced his clerical career, one of the works to which he devoted much time, for a most inadequate remuneration, was a new and greatly enlarged edition of "The Complete Grazier." Yet more strange will it appear to some that the book purported to be "by a Lincolnshire Grazier;" from which he was jestingly called "the Lincolnshire Grazier" for some time afterwards in our family. He never seemed displeased with the joke, but I have heard him explain that the title was the bookseller's concern, not his, having been affixed to the first edition of the work, and that consequently he had not been so much as consulted about it. It was no small proof of the skill and thoroughness he threw into his labour upon this book, that it had much acceptance with the class for whose use

it was designed; many of whom regarded as an oracle in their own line that unknown "Lincolnshire" man, who had at that time hardly ever in his life, perhaps, been beyond the suburbs of London. Nor was it less amusing to his friends to find that, on all fitting occasions, "his talk was of oxen;" and that for several years he regularly attended the Smithfield Cattle Show, accompanied by a gentleman, well known to me, whose taste lay in that direction, and who professed to receive much edification from his remarks.

But now, where I well remember to have been the "Leverian Museum," arose, and flourished for some years, the "Surrey Literary Institution;" and that same connection with the Wesleyan body to which he was indebted for his introduction to Mr. Butterworth, served him in good stead when, through the interest of Dr. Adam Clarke, he was appointed Sub-Librarian, Dr. Clarke himself being Honorary Librarian-in-Chief. This was the grand stepping-stone to Mr. Horne's rise in life, as it gave him a very fair salary, greatly extended his acquaintance with the world, and, by the excellent library it placed under his control, was of much service to his literary pursuits. I was a frequent reader in the library, and saw much of my worthy friend in his new capacity. I had not many companions in my studies; but as the books circulated among the proprietors and subscribers, persons were often coming in to return those taken out, or to obtain others for perusal, and the registration of the exits and re-entrances of the volumes seemed to form the principal business of Mr. H. as connected with his post. He was as busy for the booksellers as ever; the only difference being that, his literary reputation being now established, he could choose the nature of his employment, and could even "give out work" to less known members of the profession, deriving of course some profit from their labours to himself. The ease and tact with which, when at the Institution, he would exchange at a moment's notice one species of occupation for another, often excited my admiration. While sitting with clouded brow over some intricate printer's "proof," some complex index to a work going through the press, or some manuscript compilation to which he was giving his soul, he would rise on the instant to devote a courteous smile and all proper services to any one to whom the duties of his office made such attentions requisite. At the same time he would permit no intrusion upon his personal avocations; and when once a leading proprietor, in my hearing, broke in upon him with "Ha! Mr. Horne, what have you got there?" the answer, in substance, if not in terms, was, that Mr. —— had no business to ask the question. Growing rich in his own estimation, and especially when, under the patronage of Mr. Speaker Abbot, he obtained £1000 for a compilation connected with the public records, he married, and never

exhibited greater wisdom than in the choice of his wife. With that ill fortune in mere business, however, some amount of which attended him through life, £500 were wasted during the first six months of his matrimonial career in an attempt to form an educational establishment, of which Mrs. Horne was to be the directress, but which, though none could doubt that lady's competency to the undertaking, attracted no pupils, and was therefore never actually commenced.

The event upon which all Mr. Horne's subsequent success and fame were founded, was the publication of his "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." Dr. Howley, Bishop of London, to whom he sent a copy, offered him ordination in token of his approbation of the work; and thenceforward he carried all the conscientious painstaking into the performance of his clerical duties which distinguished him in whatever he undertook. And here I cannot but take exception, though with due respect, to Mr. Mardon's broad statement that "the learning of Mr. Horne," as exhibited in the celebrated "Introduction," "was *filched* from the Presbyterian ministers" whom he names. It seems to me much more correct to say, in the words of another writer quoted by Mr. M. that the Introduction "may be pronounced an excellent *vade mecum* on the wide range of subjects which it treats, containing as it does a collection of passages, not more remarkable for their extent and variety than for their valuable quality, derived from some of the most able and accomplished of Christian apologists, Unitarian and Trinitarian." I quite agree with Mr. Mardon that Mr. Horne "was no original theologian;" but I am not less certain that he was incapable throughout life of an action that did not square with his own ideas of perfect integrity. And neither in his writings nor his conversation respecting them did he ever claim, so far as I am aware, originality as an author. He may be said to have lived to obtain information by reading, to digest it for his own use, and then to condense and spread it by his pen for the use of others. The Preface to the second edition of his great work, and which was repeated, I believe, in all the subsequent ones (I have it in the seventh), plainly states his design to be to furnish "a comprehensive Manual of Sacred Literature, selected from the labours of the most eminent Biblical Critics, both British and Foreign." He adds, what supplies the key to the right consideration of this question, that the book "originated in the author's own wants at an early period of life." The truth, I have no doubt, is, that Mr. Horne had collected a large mass of materials on biblical subjects for his private benefit from writers who had gone before him, long before the idea of publishing occurred to him; that he had not always minuted down with his after particularity the volumes and the pages from which

these were taken, and had interspersed them with much that was his own; and that when at length he resolved to publish, it would have been no small labour to himself, and of very little utility to his readers, to give his authorities in every instance. Still, we have only to look into his work to see that the number of his references to prior authors is truly enormous; and, taking up one of his volumes, and opening it at random, I find he acknowledges his obligations to *Lardner*, who stands at the head of the list of those from whom he is said to have "filched,"—I am sorry to have to repeat the word,—no less than forty-five times in the course of seventeen pages! (See Vol. I. pp. 70—86.) I make these remarks in pure regard to justice to the memory of an excellent man, with whom I was both long and intimately acquainted.

When I first began to suspect the correctness of orthodoxy, I regarded it as my simple duty to go to Mr. Horne and state my doubts. I am bound to say that his solution of my difficulties, while it seemed perfectly to satisfy himself, had not that effect upon his querist. I have a perfect recollection of some incidents connected with the call at which I at length avowed to him my Unitarianism. He expressed much regret, as I expected; then, with some warmth, said he had as much right to be called a Unitarian as any man who so styled himself,—meaning that the strict Unity of God was not at all impugned by the doctrine of the three persons: in the end he spoke with respect of several Unitarian ministers and writers whom he named, particularly mentioning the late Dr. Carpenter, and allowed that the critical labours of Griesbach had given strength to the Unitarian argument from Scripture. Afterwards seeing Mrs. Horne, who was ignorant of what had passed in her husband's study between him and myself, she took occasion to remark, with motherly affection and pride, on the excellent dispositions of her two little daughters, then aged, I should suppose, some four and five years respectively. She said, "they did not know what a falsehood was." I thought, but did not observe, that there was some discrepancy between this statement and belief in the doctrine of original sin; also that it supplied a reason for our not accepting in their literality the Psalmist's words, "They go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies."

From the period of the interview just spoken of, I had little communication with Mr. Horne. I imagine we each felt that our paths in life must thenceforward be considerably divergent. It may be right, in conclusion, to say that I have not seen the volume of "Reminiscences, Personal and Biographical," recently published, nor was aware of its existence till I read the review of it in the number of the *Christian Reformer* that has been referred to. I expect on perusing it to find no opposition between anything contained in it and what I have here said.

T. C.

NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Sons of Adam.

Our travellers in the East tell us that the Arabic nations consider themselves as the sons of Adam, and think that Europeans and other strangers have no claim to that high title. By sons of Adam we may suppose that they mean those races that we usually call sons of Shem, namely, the nations which speak Hebrew and the kindred languages. Many of the writers of the Old Testament seem to have had the same opinion, and have called the favoured races, not sons of Shem, but sons of Adam, as distinguished from the heathen or the other nations of the world, whom they called sons of men. This distinction is lost in our English Bibles, where the translators have at all times been more anxious to conceal the peculiarities of the original than to explain them, and to make the Bible fit our modern philosophy rather than to teach us the opinions of the writers. I will give a few quotations to shew how these words are used.

Psalm xlix. 1.

Give ear, all ye inhabitants of the world,
Both sons of Adam and sons of men,
Rich and poor together.

Psalm lxii. 9.

Truly the sons of Adam are vanity,
The sons of men are falsehood.

Psalm xii. 8.

The wicked walk on every side
As a great terror to the sons of Adam.

Psalm xi. 4.

The Lord's throne is in the heavens,
His eyes behold, his eyelids try, the sons of Adam.
The Lord trieth the righteous,
But the wicked, and him that loveth violence, his soul hateth.

Numbers xxiii. 19.

God is not a man that he should lie,
Or a son of Adam that he should repent.

In many of these cases it may be argued that, according to the known peculiarity of Hebrew poetry, the one thought is repeated in new words, and that sons of men, and sons of Adam, may differ only in sound and not in meaning. But the parallelism of Hebrew poetry is as often marked by their opposition as by their agreement, and it will at least be allowed that when the two are contrasted, the sons of Adam are put in the more favourable light.

Deuteronomy xxxii. 8.

When the Most High divided to the Gentiles their inheritance,
When he separated the sons of Adam,
He set the bounds of the people,
According to the number of the children of Israel.

Here at least the sons of Adam and the Gentiles are placed in distinct opposition, and none of our translators have ventured to conceal it. The same distinction between the favoured race and the Gentiles is marked in Genesis vi. by calling the former the sons of God, where their intermarriage with any but their own nation, an act always so unpopular, is described as the sons of God marrying the daughters of men.

The books of the Old Testament, written in such very different centuries, may well be allowed to shew us different opinions about the origin of the human race; and hence, while the book of Genesis tells us that every man now living is a descendant of Noah, and through him a descendant of Adam, we need not be surprised at other Hebrew writers using the title in a more limited sense. At any rate, it is of the first importance that our translators should have the courage to shew us these Hebrew peculiarities, so that the English reader may judge for himself whether they are peculiarities of thought or only peculiarities of expression.

In the book of Ezekiel, the prophet is everywhere addressed by the Almighty as "thou son of Adam." This the Septuagint translates, son of man; and hence would seem to have been borrowed that title which in the New Testament we find given to Jesus. In the New Testament, the title must be left as it is, but I see no reason why in the book of Ezekiel it should not be translated, son of Adam. In Deuteronomy xxxii. 8, no critic has ventured to translate these words otherwise than sons of Adam.

Sins of Ignorance.

Psalm xix. 12.

Sins of ignorance, who can discern?
Cleanse thou me from hidden faults;
Restrain thy servant also from presumptuous sins.

The word Errors of the Authorized Version hardly describes with sufficient clearness the sins of ignorance of the Hebrew law. In Leviticus, chap. iv., the Jews are ordered, whenever they have discovered that they have sinned through ignorance, or done anything unawares that they should not have done, then to bring a sin-offering to Jehovah. This is distinguished from the guilt-offering of Leviticus vi., which a man is to bring if he has committed a fraud or sworn falsely. This peculiarity in the Hebrew mind that they allowed the possibility of sins of ignorance, should be attended to in the translation of Hebrews ix. 7, where we read that the priest made sacrifice once a year "for himself and for the people's sins of ignorance." A better view of morality now leads us to consider that a sin of ignorance is no sin at all, as it has taught us that a ceremonial work of the law is no good work at all. Hence perhaps there was at the time no great harm in supposing that a ceremonial work could cleanse a man from a

sin of ignorance, though now it leads to some confusion of ideas. It was only from sins of ignorance that the blood of Christ is said to cleanse us in the Epistle to the Hebrews, or at most from the fault of having omitted any of the dead works of the law (chap. ix. 14). The writer does not suppose that the blood of Christ is to cleanse men from real sin.

S. S.

THE PRISON CHAPLAIN.*

One of the most perplexing problems growing out of our present civilization is, how we are to dispose of and treat our criminal class. We are spending ten millions a year in various agencies designed to effect the repression of crime, and yet we find new difficulties, and some of them pregnant with most dangerous results, in our path. When the Tudors ruled, they tried to meet the difficulty which now causes us so much anxiety by a very summary process. By the aid of the gallows, year by year hundreds, nay thousands, of the wicked ceased from troubling. With our better civilization, our Christian consciences could not be at rest with such a Draconic policy going on before our eyes. With a humane penal code in operation like ours, the gallows is no relief. Every year the proportion in English society of convict population increases. Not less than 100,000 offenders, after paying the penalty of their crimes, are let loose every year upon society. But this is not the worst of the case. The colonies which once relieved the mother country of its worst criminals, refused any longer "to keep an open cesspool for the criminal sewage of England." We were then compelled to consume our own criminal smoke. The number of criminals in durance soon exceeded our power of safe detention. During the last eight or nine years we have been trying, with but poor results, the ticket-of-leave system. In carrying out this bold experiment, more than 11,000 criminals, many of them of the worst type, have been permitted to return to freedom and mingle in our every-day English life. Of these, a large proportion have abused their liberty, and about 20 per cent. have been brought back to endure penal coercion. What the proportion may be of those who have abused their freedom but have hitherto escaped re-capture, we cannot venture to guess; but the records of growing crime in the daily papers create the painful impression that our social condition is one of increasing danger, from

---

* The Prison Chaplain: a Memoir of the Rev. John Clay, B.D., late Chaplain of the Preston Gaol, with Selections from his Reports and Correspondence, and a Sketch of Prison Discipline in England. By his Son, the Rev. Walter Lowe Clay, M.A. of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. 8vo. Pp. 621. Cambridge—Macmillan and Co. 1861.

the number of criminals and convicts now at large. In a leading article of the *Times* of August 14, we read these words: "England is now trying the experiment of 'absorbing' her own criminals, and she does not find it altogether a profitable one. But if we cannot transport offenders to our colonies as we used to do, this is an experiment which we must make, and we must take the consequences of it so far as the experiment itself is necessary." After some observations against the ticket-of-leave system, the writer continues—"It is certain, from the plainest statistics, that outrage and violent crimes increase in proportion as the ticket-of-leave multiplies. The judicial statistics of last year give an increase of 556 burglaries over the preceding year; and the same judicial statistics give an increase also of about a thousand tickets-of-leave in that year over the preceding year. Nor have we seen the last of this growth and multiplication. The Penal Servitude Act of 1853, which did not allow mitigation of sentence, dies out this year, and leaves full and uninterrupted scope to the ticket-of-leave system. We may therefore expect a still larger harvest of this class of crimes. It is evident that something must be done."

However unpleasing the topic may be, the condition and discipline of our prisons becomes a subject of grave importance. Those 100,000 pupils are becoming every month better or worse; and it behoves us to look to them with the utmost vigilance, and to do what we can to cure their imperfections and to aid them so far as they are educating their unhappy inmates for entering anew on the duties and temptations of free social life.

It is not an uncommon thing to hear the chaplain of the gaol or the hulks spoken of as one of the consenting means to the corruption of society, by his too credulous faith in the professions of amendment on the part of criminals, and by his imprudent attestation to the fitness of these men for liberty.

If gaol chaplains blunder in this matter, and if their blunders prove serious in their consequences, endangering alike the safety of life and property, we can scarcely wonder, nor has society much right to complain, when it is remembered of what sort of materials gaol chaplains are sometimes manufactured, and what rewards are offered them for the performance of their laborious and distasteful duties. It has been the custom to regard a gaol chaplaincy as open to those clergyman who have commonly failed to prove themselves fit for any other clerical duty. The salaries, though better than those offered to the chaplains in workhouses (from £10 to £50 per annum), are, except in a few favoured counties, little better than those attached to curacies.

At a time when the education and reform of our criminals is forcing itself upon the attention of thoughtful persons, the publication of the book of which we have now given the title is

timely. If we do not err in our estimate of its value and of the character and public services of the remarkable man whose biography it contains, it will receive considerable attention, and will be regarded as a useful manual for gaol chaplains and others called upon to minister to criminals.

There are few portions of the volume which do not give proofs of the ability of the writer and of his knowledge of the subject on which he writes. But it is sadly deficient in arrangement. Historical statements, economical disquisitions, biographical details, private letters and public reports, are jumbled together in strange disorder. It will, however, be matter of regret if this literary defect in the younger Mr. Clay derogates in any degree from the honour which the public ought to pay to his excellent father, of whom we now propose to give a brief account.

John Clay, the son of a ship-and-anchor smith, was born in Liverpool, May 10, 1796. He was as a child delicate, and his life was in danger from the small-pox. But the run of a farm-house restored him to health, perhaps at the cost for a time of his intellectual development, for he was painfully slow in mastering the first elements of education, and acquired in the family, unjustly enough as the result shewed, the reputation of being not only dull, but almost a hopeless dunce. But though at a later period than with other members of his family, the development of power came in time. The precocious talents of a brother, younger than himself by two years, roused his emulation. He did not choose to be surpassed by a junior, and, applying himself with dogged resolution to study, took and kept the lead in their common tasks. Being destined for a merchant's counting-house, he had no higher training than a private commercial school, kept by a Mr. Wylie, afforded. But it must have been of the better sort of commercial schools, for, in addition to figures and penmanship, he there acquired a slight knowledge of French and Latin. He passed the six years of his life before he came of age in the counting-houses of two Liverpool merchants, and but for their failures he might have remained perched on a stool in similar establishments to the close of his life.

Happily for himself, he employed a portion of his leisure in systematic self-improvement, mastering more than one modern language, familiarizing himself with the best works in English literature, and not neglecting general science. Though an insatiable reader, he was not a mere bookworm, but excelled in practical mechanics, was skilled in all kinds of athletic exercises, could box, run, skate and use the sword exercise with the best of his day, and had not entirely neglected painting and music. Some of his mechanical inventions in early youth have survived and been found useful to the present day. A less common talent developed by him during this period of his life was in

private theatricals. As *Farmer Harrowby* in Colman's comedy of the "Poor Gentleman," and in *Fusbos* in "Bombastes Furioso," he won commendations from the actor known as "Gentleman Knight." Unlike some of his brethren of the cloth who have trod the stage, he felt no shame respecting it in after life, and had no scruple in alluding to this portion of his experience. If he found himself in company with very grave people and paricularly if a bishop were present, he loved in his clerical days to begin a story with, "When I was on the stage."

Not without its use in reference to the specialty of his life as a prison chaplain was his diversified youthful experience. It is sometimes and justly lamented that clergymen, who need, as much as lawyers and magistrates, accurate knowledge of human nature, often enter on their important parochial duties as raw and inexperienced in the practical affairs of life as hermits or monks. Emerging from the monastic seclusion of a college, accustomed to the language of books and the phraseology of the lecture-room rather than the talk of men and women, they generally fail at first to reach the understanding of the majority of those they address. Very different was the training of John Clay; and he may have owed some portion of his success as spiritual pastor to a very untoward flock, to the early vicissitudes of his youthful life in the docks and counting-house, on the cricket-ground, in the fencing-room, and when fretting his hour of vanity on the stage.

It was a fortunate disappointment in his plan of life that at the age of twenty-one he was thrown out of employment and compelled to make an entirely new cast.

"While still in this state of uncertainty he went on a visit to the house of his connexion and very kind friend, Mr. Charles Swainson, of Cooper Hill, near Preston. Versatile, genial, warm-hearted, and with a marvellous capacity for making himself useful, he was soon as prime a favourite in Mr. Swainson's household as in his own home. The visit was protracted from week to week, and eventually turned into a residence which extended over many years. At an early period of the visit Mr. Swainson, who had formed a high opinion of his sterling character and abilities, strongly urged him to take Holy Orders. The insufficiency of his education, and the inability of his father to bear the expense of sending him to college (even if his age—he was now twenty-two—had not rendered it unadvisable), seemed to him at first insuperable objections; but the thought, once presented, grew rapidly into a strong desire, and before long he adopted Mr. Swainson's advice, and devoted himself with intense application to the studies necessary for the bishop's examination. For rather more than a year he read as a private pupil with the Rev. Robert Harris, then Head Master of the Preston Grammar School, making the Greek Testament his chief study.

"In February, 1821, he lost his father. In August of the same year the assistant chaplaincy of the House of Correction was unexpectedly offered to him. There was an ordination at Kendal five days after the

offer was made. Dr. Law, the then Bishop of Chester, was known not to be fond of 'Literates;' moreover, there was no precedent for accepting a prison chaplaincy as a title to orders, the usual notice of candidateship had not been given, and the bishop was a stickler for episcopal punctilios. However, on the urgent recommendation of some potential friends, the bishop waived his objections, and he was ordained deacon on the 11th of August, 1821. On the 22d of September, 1822, he was ordained priest at Chester."—Pp. 8, 9.

To atone for the deficiencies of his education, he gave himself zealously to the study of the classics and of theology, and entered himself at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and, thirteen years after his ordination, took the degree of Bachelor in Divinity.

The circumstances that led to Mr. Clay's becoming a prison chaplain were by no means promising of zeal or excellence. It was to him almost a sort of Hobson's choice, for the only other title to orders which his county presented was a curacy in a church and parish so large as to destroy the lungs and health of successive curates. He felt no special call to his work. Practical philanthropy had not then taken any deep root in the English mind. Gaol chaplaincies were filled by men who could get nothing better. The post was one neither of profit nor honour.

In the Preston House of Correction, previously to 1821, the duties of the chaplain had been performed in the usual slovenly manner by an incumbent of a neighbouring parish, who further eked out his professional income by an under-mastership in the grammar-school. The best thing we read of him as gaol chaplain was, that his sermons were "always homely," and often contained close personal applications that were not acceptable to the men he strove to benefit.

It was the work of a magistrate then recently put on the commission, Mr. Addison, to reform the nature of the spiritual oversight of the inmates of the Preston House of Correction. The first scheme was a Ladies' Committee; but not even Mrs. Fry herself, though she twice made the attempt, could rouse in the dames of proud Preston the requisite philanthropic zeal. Next, Mr. Addison proposed the appointment of an assistant chaplain; the proposal was adopted and Mr. Clay was elected. The death of his senior in 1823 led to his appointment to the sole chaplaincy. Just before this appointment, an event of no small importance in its influence on prison reform had taken place, the passing of the Gaol Act. This statute consolidated and harmonized previous Acts relating to prisons, and gave the force of law to many of the wise and humane doctrines which, through the patient teaching of such men as Howard, Romilly, Mackintosh and their coadjutors and disciples, had at last been accepted by statesmen as truths. The weak part of the Gaol Act was its neglect of the principle of separation of prisoners.

In its place, it adopted, mainly on the authority of Mrs. Fry, that of classification. The inmates of gaols were to consist of five classes: 1, debtors; 2, convict felons; 3, convict misdemeanants; 4, untried felons; 5, untried misdemeanants. In houses of correction, the only difference was that the first class consisted of vagrants. Classification of crime is not the same as classification according to character. The tyro and the adult in crime are on this principle banded together; and the prison, instead of being the means and instrument of reformation, may instruct and harden in evil-doing.

The more valuable provisions of the Gaol Act were those which placed female prisoners under the charge of matrons and officers of their own sex, which provided for short daily services in the chapel, for instruction in writing and reading, and restrictions on the power of the gaoler, and necessitated periodical reports to the Court of Quarter Sessions, the Home Secretary and Parliament. The Act also prescribes hard labour for most of the prisoners.

A few years before the passing of the Gaol Act, Mr. Cubitt had invented the tread-mill to reduce the turbulent prisoners in the gaol at Bury. Mr. Bentham had at a much earlier period suggested something of the same kind, which he called a "walking-wheel."

But, according to the author of this biography, "the idea did not then catch the magisterial fancy." He should rather have said that Bentham's plans of prison construction and discipline, though approved and accepted by the Government of the day, were suppressed, at some cost to the nation, in deference to the narrow and prejudiced antipathies of George III. The tread-mill was now adopted in all the larger prisons, and their indolent but often witty inmates gave to this new machine the name of "the everlasting staircase." Romantic anticipations of its potency in eradicating bad habits were in many quarters indulged. Magistrates and others who watched the working of the machine and noted the hatred with which criminals regarded it, imagined that after a certain time spent in climbing this painful ladder, hardened criminals would change their nature and become honest and industrious. The steady labour which the unceasing ascent demanded was in the last degree distasteful to prisoners who in many cases had embarked on a course of crime simply from their dislike of everything like work. The well-fledged gaol-bird made the new instrument of torture the subject of careful study, and presently discovered how to mount the ladder with the least toil. In a year or two the swing of the practised tread-miller revealed in an instant to the experienced eye of the gaoler an old hand.

The Preston House of Correction, which was the theatre for a long series of years of Mr. Clay's judicious and persevering

labours, was reputedly a well-conducted prison at a time when abominations of every kind abounded in other prisons. Yet it was far from being throughout a reformatory establishment.

"Efficient and successful as the management of the prison was commonly considered, the evils that were apparent and tolerated were quite sufficient to anger and pain him; and he soon found that there was much hidden vice and corruption besides. The discipline in the yards was wretched,—thieving, gambling, swearing, sparring, and smoking were practised with impunity, for the 'constable of the yard' (a prisoner, not a turnkey) was commonly both unable and unwilling to check the disorder. But bad as was the open riot and blasphemy, there was worse underneath: vile practices and disgusting profligacy, to which the turnkeys were suspiciously blind. Their frail honesty, in fact, was not proof against a fee, nor even against the temptation to levy toll on the property of the county. But it was a difficult task to prove these abuses. The bench officially disbelieved in their existence; indeed, as he could never produce any conclusive evidence in support of his complaints, they were, for many years, shuffled aside with hardly any examination. Among the justices he acquired the character of being restless and meddlesome, and of course he earned abundant ill-will among the officers of the prison.

"To toil and moil, here a little and there a little, to make the Gaol more wholesome and cleanly, was his first undertaking. To provide the prisoners with water enough to wash with (a bucketful in the morning for each yard was the previous allowance); to enforce habits of cleanliness; to ventilate crowded work-rooms; to drain water-soaked cells; to wash filthy prisoners on their admission, and fumigate their clothes; to establish clothing stores—for prisoners often came in and went out half naked and bare-foot, and the mothers of prison-born babies had to wrap them in their own rags—on such matters as these his first and freshest energies were spent. At the same time, he set himself, by quick vigilance and prompt punishment, to improve the discipline. Fighting, gaming, pocket-picking, and swearing, he succeeded in checking to some extent, and he strove hard to restrain the pernicious intercourse which was freely permitted between prisoners and visitors."—Pp. 110, 111.

It was in 1825 that the tread-mill was introduced at Preston. Mr. Clay watched closely its operation and effects, and came soon to the conclusion that, however effective it might be as a means of punishment, it was powerless as an instrument of moral reform.

He soon saw the necessity of a prison school, and worked the scheme through a series of difficulties, at first employing as teachers the better class of prisoners. Then he found that the industrial plans of the prison exhausted the time and strength of those whom he wished to have as pupils. He fell back on a Sunday-school, and it was worked with some success, some of the prisoners learning the art of reading in the prison Sunday-school, with convicts as their teachers. Eventually he induced the magistrates to appoint a schoolmaster; he also succeeded in

obtaining the services of a matron to superintend the employments and discipline of the female prisoners.

For some years his plans were more or less thwarted by uncongenial gaolers. One—the man he found in office—is described as "a rough and ready bully, with a flavour of goodnature, and wit enough to manage the prison cheaply," who had passed to his place at the head of the House of Correction through the grades of a serjeant in the army, butler to a county magistrate, and a publican. Ultimately this man was peremptorily dismissed for peculation, neglect of discipline and of cleanliness, and the encouragement of gambling. The next gaoler was honest, but rough, capricious and tyrannical. All that he aimed at was a kind of quarter-deck discipline: for education and the influences of religion on the criminal mind he had little respect, and a zealous and hopeful chaplain he regarded as a mere dreamer of dreams. For a time the majority of the bench sided with the gaoler as against the chaplain, and poor Mr. Clay had to put up with many disappointments in respect to his benevolent plans, and sometimes to personal mortifications.

He cared little for mere paper plans and ideal schemes for reforming prisoners. He soon found that little good came from the lavish distribution among prisoners of Bibles and good books and tracts. He learnt that the only mode of procedure that gave the promise of beneficial results was to acquire the respect and confidence of the men he desired to amend. They were as a class too shrewd to be caught by the services of a mere professional religion, but notwithstanding all the bad and hardening influences of their previous lives, they could not resist the persevering and consistent manifestation of kindness. After describing some of his less successful modes of influencing prisoners, his biographer proceeds thus:

"But one religious weapon he had, which even in that vice-breeding prison wrought with some effect, and that was his own almost womanly kindliness. In every case that came before him, he searched with eagerness for some means of doing a judicious kindness. He would bring news from home to the prisoners, and write, or take in person, their messages back. Whenever he thought good might result he would procure interviews between convicts and their friends. On their discharge, he would, if possible, find work for all who were willing to work, and he would strive to effect reconciliations between them and their friends. For the poor homeless girl, if there was the least hope that her repentance was sincere, he would find admission into the Liverpool Penitentiary. If he thought a prisoner hardly treated, he would always importune for a mitigation of the sentence. If he was convinced of a convict's innocence, he would toil with all his marvellous pertinacity—very careless what trouble he caused, or what offence he gave—till he had exhausted every chance of procuring a pardon. In the prison he uniformly interfered to prevent the infliction of capricious and vindictive punishments. He often sharply rescued poor creatures from the rapacity and

brutality of constables, and not seldom forced his remonstrances and complaints on the notice of heedless or tyrannical justices. By such means he gradually acquired great influence, both among the prisoners and the classes from which they were drawn. Within the Gaol he was established as the redresser of grievances, while parents and friends outside resorted to him on all emergencies for help and advice."—Pp. 117, 118.

Conduct like this won him the respect of the prisoners, and very rare indeed was any instance of incivility on their part to the chaplain. Men ready enough to revile the race of parsons, would make an exception in his favour. The growth of his influence, both within and out of the House of Correction, was slow and gradual, but sure. When, in accordance with the better system which followed the Gaol Act, he began to prepare an annual report, the facts and opinions presented by him to the magistrates presently attracted attention. The local press noticed his plans of reform, statistical societies began to build theories on his carefully digested facts, and his name was becoming known as an authority on prison discipline and criminal reform.

Mr. Clay's experience soon convinced him that Mrs. Fry's system of classification was inoperative and delusive as a means of reform, and long before the magistrates were ready to carry the plan into practical operation, he was satisfied that individual separation must be the first step in any efficient prison discipline. In his Report in 1838, he thus states the benefits and dangers of the system:

"... The majority of the inspectors of prisons is in favour of the separate plan; by which is meant, the individual and entire seclusion of prisoners from each other, in cells of about 13 feet by 7, and 10 feet high, which are to be provided with every requisite for warmth, and ventilation, and cleanliness: the prisoners to be furnished with employment; to be visited daily by the principal officers, and to attend chapel on the Sabbath, under such regulations as shall ensure the integrity of the system. Many and powerful arguments are advanced in support of this plan, and there can be little doubt that it must have great advantages. Religious feelings, and the consequent probability of permanent reformation, are certain, in many cases, to be awakened in a solitude which is chiefly interrupted by the visits of the minister of religion. Contamination, if the system be perfectly administered, is impossible. While it has its consolations for the serious or devout, it has none whatever for the hardened; and is therefore adapted to reform the one, and deter the other. It may be said indeed to possess, as regards the characters of the confined, a *self-adjusting* principle. These are only a few, though probably the most prominent, of the reasons in favour of the plan of separation. The objections made to it must now be mentioned: they are, first, the very great expense which would be incurred by carrying out the system into full operation. 2d,—The tendency to insanity which it is said to produce in prisoners who undergo a long confinement. 3d,—The difficulty of providing suitable employment,

especially such as would be available to the prisoner on his discharge; and, lastly, the fact, as stated in the report of the inspector of Scotland (a gentleman favourable, nevertheless, to the system), that at Glasgow, the only place in this country, I believe, where the plan has been fully tested, the recommittals are 50 per cent."—Pp. 140, 141.

In prisons which afforded no convenience for the separate system, that of silent simultaneous labour was attempted. In behalf of this system, it was alleged that it combined with the exaction of social duties the encouragement of the habit of self-control. On the other hand, it was alleged that it offered to prisoners a constant provocative to attempt to elude the keeper's vigilance, and thus led to a kind of excitement deleterious because destructive of moral reform.

A brief description of the system as amended at Preston and carried out under the influence of Mr. Clay, will best elucidate his good sense and Christian humanity and hopefulness.

The tread-wheel, introduced in 1825, was abolished. When the humane and Christian principle was recognized that the reformation of a prisoner was an object more to be sought than his punishment, it became apparent that while the mind was irritated and harassed by the ever-present consciousness of punishment, there was and could be no place and opportunity for calm thought and penitent feeling. In 1843, seventy-two cells, properly warmed and ventilated, were completed, and from this time the discipline at Preston assumed a highly improved character, the improvement being entirely in the direction of a *reformatory* kind. Public opinion was at first against the system of separate confinement, the chief objections being that it led to the loss of reason and destruction of health, and that it was excessively costly. As to the first objections, they were satisfactorily met by modifications of the system of separate confinement. As to the objection of cost, there is the fact that the annual cost of a prisoner at Preston was £16, and that amount is often greatly reduced (say to £11) by repayments from the produce of the prisoner's industry. On the other hand, it has been estimated that the cost to a country like England of a thief at large and in the pursuit of his calling is about £150 a-year. The rent of each cell at Preston may be estimated at about £3 per annum.

When the sentenced criminal enters the Preston House of Correction, he is cleansed and clothed in the prison dress, examined by the surgeon, and then, if healthy, passed on at once to work, either in a separate cell or in the work-room. In the latter, during the hours of labour, sixty to a hundred prisoners are engaged, under constant and vigilant supervision; the strictest silence is observed, except when, the allotted work being finished, one of the better educated prisoners reads aloud for the instruction of all.

"Here, in Preston, while the personal discipline is severe enough to

deter such as give no hope of something better, our chief efforts are used to produce permanent amendment of character, by rousing into life and action the religious principle originally planted in the breast, and never altogether effaced. Order, cleanliness, and obedience, are enforced to a degree which must be most irksome to persons accustomed only to irregularity and dirt; two hours of active exercise, daily, preserves the bodily health, and keeps up elasticity of mind: instruction in reading, writing, arithmetic, &c., is given—and received—as a valuable privilege: work is supplied to all—except when compulsory idleness is inflicted for breach of prison rules,—and the value of regular occupation thereby taught; and those who can exercise their trade in a cell, are permitted to do so,—a boon which is most highly valued."—P. 278.

At Preston was first practised the great reformatory improvement of applying the separate system to untried prisoners. The mass of them enter the House of Correction not systematic thieves, but men or boys led incidentally into crime by ignorance, dissipation or drunkenness. Under the old system of herding the untried together in a common room and yard, the consequences were that hardened and skilful criminals became instructors in all that was bad of those young in crime, and the prisoner, even if acquitted, re-entered the world with a much worse and more dangerous character than that with which he came to the gaol. The prison reformer was met at first by the superficial objection that Government had no right to punish a prisoner before he was convicted. But in reality it was a punishment of the severest kind to an innocent prisoner to be compelled to associate for weeks or months with adepts in crime, whose talk was an incessant stream of moral corruption.

"Let us look," said Mr. Clay in 1846, "at the result of this separation, and we shall find the moral condition of the discharged prisoner *now*, in most happy contrast with what I have attempted to describe above. The prisoner is not now dismissed from his confinement with an imagination heated by the tales of successful plunder which he has heard in 'the yard,' and with a determination to rival the exploits of Turpin and Sheppard. Now, instead of exciting others to crime he is himself desirous to forsake it. He has no stories of his acquaintance redolent of the treadwheel and trial-yard; but when he speaks of prison, he speaks of stern, but wholesome, restraint; of friendly admonition, of the good thoughts which came into his mind when alone in his cell, of his grief for the grief he has caused to those who loved him, of his penitence for his fault, of his prayers for forgiveness, and of his resolution, by God's grace, to sin no more. . . . .

"[After referring to the good accounts received from the police concerning forty-two out of sixty prisoners liberated from separate confinement] I have yet further evidence in support of the views I advocate, which, if not more convincing than what I have already brought forward, is perhaps more interesting,—that of the prisoners themselves. During the process of self-examination which a prisoner, capable of exercising it, must undergo in his cell, he is encouraged to review his past life, and to trace to their source his faults and sufferings. Many

of the prisoners have availed themselves of this encouragement in a way which, while useful to themselves, will be, I think, also useful to those who inquire into the mental and moral state of the labouring classes. They have written, and sometimes dictated to me or to the schoolmaster, short narratives of their lives, their delinquencies, their self-convictions, and their penitence. Of these narratives I possess a volume consisting of more than 300 folio (MS.) pages; and it is scarcely too much to say that while evincing the beneficial process going on in the writers' minds, every page illustrates a history of which we are yet too ignorant,—the actual social and moral state of our poor fellow-subjects. Yet the native strong sense of the Anglo-Saxon character shines through almost every tale of temptation and sin, and must add to our regret that such materials for building up 'a great nation—an understanding people,' should lie neglected and exposed to influences equally injurious to their physical and moral state. We see them, boys or men, as they appear at one period, sinking beneath the moral evils which, sometimes surrounding them at their birth, sometimes involving them afterwards, too often beset their position in the *world;* and again, after a time of chastening, we see them prepared to occupy a better and happier place in the community, their mental and religious capabilities having been developed in *prison!*"—Pp. 273, 274.

Mr. Clay was no advocate for the total isolation of prisoners. The solitude he recommended was that which experience proved to be sufficient in duration and strictness to make the prisoner think and to save him from further contamination.

How Mr. Clay performed the duties which specially devolved on him as chaplain is well told by his son.

"He never suffered the religious teaching to degenerate into mere prison routine. It was his endeavour as much as possible to make the prisoner welcome religion as an alleviation of his punishment. He would have been the last to fall into the mistake (committed in some Gaols) of prescribing a certain religious dietary for the convicts. Nothing, in fact, could have been more repugnant to his feelings than to enforce a fixed spiritual regimen as part of the discipline. If, by an evil necessity, a man was left to learn what a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health, for the first time in a prison, he would do all that lay in his power to make the memory of that first lesson a pleasant one; not the memory of an irksome, hateful prison-task, but of a precious boon, which had rendered even the blank cell a tolerable—perhaps a happy place.

"With this object in view, he sought to render the school, the chapel, and his own visits to the cells, all valued privileges.

"In the school the men met in open classes, and were not locked up in boxes, as in other cellular prisons. They were indeed forbidden to speak, except to the master; but the penalty of expulsion from the class was quite sufficient to ensure implicit submission to the prohibition. Great care was taken to make the lessons so interesting, short, and infrequent, as to ensure their being enjoyed and prized."—Pp. 197, 198.

For more than fifteen years Mr. Clay read his sermons; it is needless to say that after he acquired the art of extempore address, his success was markedly improved.

"The spectacle of those two or three hundred upturned faces—blotched, sin-stricken, ugly faces, generally—staring with half-stolid animal-like fixedness at the preacher, was one not easily forgotten. Few men, probably, could have cast such a spell, as he did, over an audience so dull-brained, so incapable of following the simplest argument. But the chief thing to be noticed was the honest means by which he gained their ears. 'I never heard anything so logical from a pulpit before,' was the remark of a very competent judge, after hearing him preach. Probably what the critic meant was, that he had never heard such a *single-topic* sermon; for this epithet, in default of a better, may be coined to describe his style. 'It is my plan,' was his own account of his sermons, 'to be content with one idea; that is quite as much as my poor people can take in at once; but I try to enunciate my one idea as distinctly and as completely as possible. My endeavour is to keep out all other subjects, which would only embarrass them, and to make all my reasons and illustrations fit together so as to build up one single complete compact notion for them to carry away.' To an educated hearer the impression left by his sermons was, that he had brought some old familiar truth, hitherto but dimly seen (as through an ill-focused telescope) into sharp clear distinctness; and the inference was, that the most stupid in the chapel, however irreceptive, would understand his meaning in some vague way at all events. The sermons were so fluent, so nearly eloquent, that one peculiarity would probably escape an uncritical listener—the scanty use of any words but monosyllables. The number of words, too, that were employed was extremely small, yet the language never seemed bald and meagre. In fact, his greatest difficulty was to find words that the prisoners could comprehend. It was his often-expressed opinion that the vocabularies of many prisoners did not contain a hundred words, beyond those expressive of their animal wants, and those belonging to their trade."—Pp. 200, 201.

It shewed Mr. Clay's strong sense that he would have nothing to do with the modern religious folly or frenzy called revivals.

"The emotions of the ignorant are so heady and uncontrollable when once aroused, and the discipline of the separate system rendered the prisoners so susceptible to excitement, that it was only seldom, and then very carefully, that he ventured to play on their feelings. Had he wished it, he might have had a revival in the prison once a month. But when he did touch the heart-strings—when, for instance, pointing to the young lads in the front rows, he appealed to fathers and mothers for mercy on their own neglected children, or when he told some moving tale of sin and misery—simple and unexciting as the language always was, yet there was something in the manner, in the voice, in the whole man, that was quite irresistible; and half the faces in the chapel, brute faces as they mostly were, would be wet with tears."—P. 201.

The biographer adds in a note a very remarkable anecdote, which we venture to prophesy will find its way into future biographies of the late Sir Robert Peel:

"On one occasion he elicited a display of emotion for which he was unprepared. He had been telling, quietly, yet with some pathos, the story of Sir Robert Peel's death. The moment the name—which had been kept back to the last—was given, it was evident that a slight sym-

pathetic shock passed through the congregation, and in a few minutes several of the older men were quietly crying. He afterwards found that among the mechanics of Lancashire, Sir Robert's name was a household word. With the very dimmest notion of what he had really done for them, they considered him the 'Friend of the Poor.'"—P. 201.

If we apply the test of success to Mr. Clay's reformatory discipline, his system comes out with strong claims on our approbation. In his Report, 1854, he says:

"I have been able to show, during several successive years, that of the discharged prisoners who returned to their homes (in the county), after undergoing the sentences of imprisonment passed on them at the sessions, upwards of 60 *per cent.* have given satisfactory evidence of decided moral improvement, or of complete and permanent reformation. And while thus, under Providence, producing these happy results, the Preston System was not chargeable with consequences which, too often, attended the severer one. In one year, 1852, the medical officer at Pentonville reported cases of insanity, delusion, mental depression, &c. &c., 'rendering removal from the prison advisable,' amounting, in all, to twenty-two. *Upon no occasion whatever have we found it necessary—or even 'advisable'—to remove either a Government convict or one of our own prisoners for a similar cause.* I am justified in affirming, therefore, that not only have reformatory measures had a sufficient trial here, but that they have been followed by results which leave no doubt as to what ought to be the main principle of prison-discipline."—Pp. 333, 334.

We have no more space at present to give to the subject of prison discipline, but we cannot part with this remarkable and sterling (though desultory and ill-arranged) volume without noticing Mr. Clay's personal and social characteristics. He was not the mere gaol chaplain, but was a genial companion, full of vivacity and wit, and a man taking a deep and an enlightened interest in all that was going on around him to benefit and instruct the masses. He was not the man to carry into society the severity, far less the sourness, of the clergyman. With the clergy of Preston, most of whom were of the so-called "Evangelical" stamp, he had little intercourse or sympathy. But we must give the description of his position as a Churchman in the words of his son:

"He was from the first a liberal, and a church reformer: he was, in fact, a Broad Churchman long before the Broad Church party existed. In his earlier life he did not hesitate to say that 'he owed his membership of the Church of England entirely to the accident of his birth; and that if he had to choose his communion over again, he would only prefer the Church because, bad as was her condition, he knew of no other religious body that was better.' Later, however, his hopes for her brightened, and his affection strengthened. He was always eager to acknowledge the increase of zeal and earnestness which marked all the ranks of the clergy during the last twenty years of his life: and he candidly confessed that the church-system rose in his esteem as his practical acquaintance with it increased. But to the last he was far from sanguine. 'If the energy,' he would often say, 'which is wasted on these miserable

controversies were combined into one great crusade against vice and ignorance, it might change the fate of England and of the world.' 'I am thankful,' he would add, 'that my isolated position as a gaol-chaplain, saves me from the danger of religious partisanship. I believe I never did, and I don't think I ever shall, deliberately utter a party word, or perform a party action.' And to this line of conduct he did in truth adhere with the most scrupulous consistency. 'Let it be said in his honour,' was a remark made in a leading provincial newspaper shortly after his death, 'that party-feeling or sectarianism, religious or political, never marred or mingled with his benevolence. No public man in this, or perhaps any other district ever indicated a more truly Catholic spirit.' Yet this Catholicity was not the result of any indifference to, or ignorance of, the great religious questions of the day. It arose from his will and power to sympathize, not as a matter of duty, but with the most unfeigned heartiness, with any man, be his creed what it might, who was willing to spend and be spent in the struggle against evil. It was this Catholic sympathy, this determination to make the best of all parties, which, more than anything else, kept him out of the ranks of all. He had the least sympathy with the Evangelicals. He rebelled against Calvinism with his whole soul. 'It is a mystery to me,' he would sometimes say in private—he hardly ever spoke of such things in public—'how many good and most thoroughly Christian men of my own acquaintance, whom I heartily reverence, can really hold a creed, which to me seems to be nothing less than horrible.'"—Pp. 576—578.

He had no sympathy with the severe Sabbatarianism so prevalent in England. He looked with suspicion on the organization of the "Evangelical" party, which he regarded as tyrannical and destructive of free-agency. He also considered the "Evangelical" clergy as the great enemies of Church reform and progress. But though many of his tastes and sympathies brought him nearer to the High-church party, he repudiated their distinctive theories, apostolical succession and ultra-sacramentalism. He was a profound admirer of Dr. Arnold, both in respect to his spirit and his theology. In politics, he worked himself out of Toryism into the liberal system of which the late Sir Robert Peel was the representative. He was an enthusiastic and indefatigable promoter of libraries and mechanics' institutions. As a popular lecturer he had won a distinguished position in Preston, taking such subjects as elocution, meteorology, acoustics, geology, sanitary laws, the divining-rod, local topography, and his own special topic, prisons.

His home duties as instructor of his own children were faithfully performed, and he was their playfellow as well as their instructor. He usually spent six hours each day in the prison; then he had generally two hours' work at home in answering letters, preparing returns and composing his periodical reports. He rarely got a holiday; and even when he had torn himself away from Preston, his thoughts were anxiously reverting to some who he knew needed his personal influence to help

them on in the path to reformation. Unintermitted toil like his of body and mind, could not but tell disastrously on his health, which gave way as early as 1846. Such a man ought at once to have been rewarded with a Church living which would have provided him with light but interesting duty and an income equal to his wants. But, as a clerical friend wrote, "During his thirty years of 'weariness and painfulness' at his dreary post, it was his lot to see some hundreds of Church livings given away by a succession of 'wise and paternal governments;' and yet John Clay died an unbeneficed clergyman." In 1854, the magistrates of the county provided an assistant chaplain, with the view of giving Mr. Clay the opportunity of regaining his broken health. But the appointment made was not a successful one. He struggled on with such remains of strength as were left him, and was able to complete his six-and-thirtieth year of prison duty. He was now entitled to a good pension, and the pain of quitting a work to which he was thoroughly devoted was lessened by finding a clergyman qualified to become his successor, and to carry on his plans in his own admirable spirit. The evening of his life was somewhat darkened by an unexpected domestic bereavement, the death of his wife, who was taken from him suddenly, after an union of thirty happy years. Severe attacks of asthma had so prostrated his strength, that his family scarcely dared to anticipate for him any further enjoyment of life. Happily their fears were disappointed, and with the aid of rest and pure air and freedom from anxious responsibility, he sufficiently recovered to pass two or three months of comfort and serenity at Leamington, the place he had selected as his last residence. There sickness overtook him in the month of November, 1858. In the wanderings of his mind an hour or two before his departure, he dreamt of a living in the country, the blessing for which he had for several years pined, being offered him by some patron lord. A smile of pleasure passed over his countenance. In less than an hour he passed quietly away to that land where crime and prisons will not be, but where, in the presence of omnipotent mercy and love, liberty and peace will be the happy lot of God's children.

The closing passage in this deeply interesting volume is a letter written in his last year to Miss Carpenter, assuring her of his interest in her philanthropic labours, and his gratitude for her sympathy and support. "Although I have finished the little work I have found to do, believe me I shall still from my quiet and I fear useless privacy watch your labours with unabating interest."

DR. ROWLAND WILLIAMS AND THE INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT OF THE DEAN OF THE COURT OF ARCHES.*

When Dr. Rowland Williams, towards the close of his noted Essay and Review, quoted Bunsen's words, "Oh the fools! who, if they see the imminent perils of this age, think to ward them off by narrow-minded persecution!" he intimated that, in the opinion of some persons, the language was "too vehement for good taste." Now that he has been made to feel the bitterness of persecution, he probably agrees with those who "think burning words needed by the disease of our time."

For our own part, we can scarcely imagine words too strong to describe properly the indiscretion of the diocesan under whom it is the unhappiness of the Vicar of Broadchalk to serve. The prosecution instituted by the Bishop of Salisbury against one of his clergy, who is the foremost man in his diocese in theological learning, and whose services to his Church have been not small as Fellow and Tutor in one of our principal colleges, as the Professor of Hebrew at Lampeter College and as a writer on theology, is in itself a fact sufficiently remarkable. Should the consequences to the Church of England prove lastingly disastrous (as possibly they may), it will be little consolation to its friends to remember that this mischief was brought about by one of the least considerable of its prelates, a man undistinguished by natural gifts or the acquirements of the scholar, and whose best security from criticism is his insignificance.

Our object in the present article is, however, chiefly to record certain facts and opinions connected with the prosecution of Dr. Williams. We desire to put these things on record in our pages, because we cannot but think that the present will prove a critical era in the religious history of this country.

It is now little more than two years since Dr. Rowland Williams published in "Essays and Reviews" a very able, instructive and singularly bold article on Bunsen's Theological Researches. Vehement as the clerical outcry against the whole volume soon became, it certainly did not cross our minds that the portion of it contributed by Dr. Rowland Williams would be the first to be the subject of legal prosecution. We saw, with others, evidences of the writer's general sympathy with the scholar of whose researches he undertook to give a sketch; but it seemed

---

* 1. Bunsen's Biblical Researches. By Rowland Williams, D.D., Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew, St. David's College, Lampeter; Vicar of Broadchalk, Wilts. (Essays and Reviews, pp. 53—93.)

2. Judgment delivered on the 25th of June, 1862, in the Case of the Bishop of Salisbury *versus* Williams, &c. By the Right Honourable Stephen Lushington, D.C.L., Dean of the Arches. Folio. Pp. 44. London—Butterworths.

3. Persecution for the Word. With a Postscript on the Interlocutory Judgment and the present State of the Case. By Rowland Williams, D.D., &c., &c. 8vo. Pp. 63. London—Longmans. 1862.

to us to involve such a dangerous limitation of what Dr. Williams calls "the old Anglican foundations of research and fair statement" to make the historian or the critic responsible for the opinions he records, that we rashly, as the result shews, anticipated that this one, at least, of the Essays and Reviews would be allowed impunity. Its author, forecasting possible objections to his Essay, intimated that "the sympathy which justifies respectful exposition need not imply entire agreement."

Undeterred by the obvious difficulties of the case, growing out of the fact that Dr. Williams rather described the opinions of another than stated or defended his own, the Bishop of Salisbury chose to take proceedings against him in the Court of Arches. The Bench of Bishops had not been unmoved by the storm, the gale of clerical indignation had ruffled their lawn sleeves; but, as a body, they wisely abstained from the recommendation of a legal remedy for the evil which they agreed in deploring. On the path which his Right Reverend colleagues feared to tread, the Prelate of Old Sarum rushed with eager and inconsiderate zeal.

The charges, contained in seventeen articles, were filed according to the course prescribed by the Church Discipline Act and brought before Dr. Lushington as Dean of Arches. The first question he had to decide was as to the admissibility of the articles. Delaying his judgment until the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had decided the appeal in the case of Burder *v.* Heath, the Dean of Arches pronounced his judgment on the 25th of June in the present year. Seldom has Westminster Hall been witness to a more important judicial proceeding.

The charge against Dr. Williams was, that in the Essay on Bunsen's Biblical Researches, he had promulgated doctrines contrary to the Articles of Religion and in derogation of the Book of Common Prayer. We are disposed to assign in Dr. Lushington's judgment as great importance to the preliminary observations as to the actual judgment respecting the admissibility of the several articles.

The able counsel of Dr. Rowland Williams had made three principal objections to the admissibility of the articles: 1, that his client did not himself maintain divers opinions imputed to him; 2, that the opinions imputed to him had been submitted to a test not warranted by ecclesiastical law, viz. extracts from the Bible; and, 3, that the opinions maintained by Dr. Williams are not such as a clergyman is forbidden to hold and publish.

The Dean of Arches, while insisting that the articles should specify the unlawful opinions objected to, also the doctrines of the Church which they contravene, and the Articles and Formularies which contain these doctrines, first considered the objec-

tion that the work articled against was not so much an original essay as a review of the writings of another. He alluded to the fact, that this was the first occasion on which a clergyman had been made answerable for opinions stated in a review. This is the decision:

"I must hold that it is not competent to the reviewer, when he either states or professes to give the substance of unsound doctrine from the work reviewed, to leave his own opinion in the dark."

We think this decision may lead to some embarrassing consequences to men who are not otherwise than "orthodox." Historians are but reviewers on a large scale, and many historians have described heresies without reprobating them. Are they liable to be articled against if they live in the diocese of a Bishop having more zeal for orthodoxy than respect for historical fairness? We can also imagine the case of an uncandid writer in whose pages the heresy shall be in the proportion of the sack in Falstaff's tavern bill, and the orthodox disclaimer in that of the halfpenny-worth of bread in the same document. There was a certain Dutch clergyman, orthodox enough in his own profession of faith, who put out an admirable exposition of the heresies of Servetus, sometimes making his Dutch translation clear where the original Latin of Servetus left the doctrine obscure. Though the Dutch reviewer did not "leave his own opinion in the dark," we question whether, if Calvin had sat upon him as Dean of the Arches in Geneva, the Dutchman would have escaped scot free.

Dr. Lushington expressed his conviction that Dr. Williams had manifested a general but not indiscriminate approval of the opinions of Baron Bunsen.

In his Postscript, Dr. Williams thus alludes to Dr. Lushington's opinion on this point:

"To a lawyer, unaware how exceedingly rare, under episcopal and other pressure, theological outspokenness has become in England, sympathy with an author's sincerity, or interest in his researches as a critic, may seem coincidence with his doctrinal definitions as a divine; and some such presumption too evidently swayed the Court's mind; but the English language contains no plainer words than those in which I have expressed my relation to my author; and I cannot become an accomplice in calumniating myself by offering more than a simple and sincere disclaimer of any doctrinal position of our Lutheran philosopher's, which, in itself, or in the harsh construction of the Court, is inconsistent with our Anglican standards. I see that it is in the power of legal technicality to extort a contradiction, where none was intended perhaps by the author, certainly none by his Reviewer."—P. 59.

Dr. Lushington distinctly refuses to apply the test of scripture to the theological views of Dr. Williams. That was not the issue he had to try. He presided over, not a Court of Divinity, but of Ecclesiastical Law. The opinions of living Bishops, the

doctrines of distinguished Churchmen, are not the materials that must sway his judgment. He must look to the Articles of Religion, the Formularies and the Canons, and, interpreting these according to legal construction, must acquit or condemn Dr. Williams as he finds his opinions accord with or contradict these standards.

He notices the obvious objection that the enforcement of the Articles and Formularies on the clergy destroys the principle on which the Reformation was founded, the right of private judgment. He rules that a person in orders may hold what opinions he will, provided they are kept within his own breast. No inquisitorial power exists to draw out and then punish latent heresy. Dr. Rowland Williams rejoices in his Postscript that all the freedom he had claimed, and more than he had claimed, for Bible investigation, "is judicially conceded as permissible in the Church of England;" and adds, "Whereas the counter claim of an episcopate to exercise a falsifying influence over hermeneutics, in virtue of the supposed interest of dogmatic theology, is repudiated as illegal."

In Dr. Lushington's judgment, nothing exceeds in clearness, or, we may add, in its startling significance, the declaration that the clergy have no right to share in new truth which militates against the Articles of Religion. We must give the passage in the Judge's own emphatic words:

"Again, it is said this authoritative imposition of doctrine would deny to Clergymen participation in modern discoveries of science or history. A difficulty thus arises. On the one hand, it seems not reasonable to suppose that it was intended to shut out all inquiry and abnegate all future discoveries, however important. On the other, the Act of the Legislature proceeded on this basis, that for the purposes intended, the Church was in possession of all the truth, and that nothing in that respect remained to be discovered. Accordingly the Articles were framed, and all Clergymen forbidden under severe penalties to impugn them. But, to remove all doubt, I will put the case in a strong point of view. I will presume a discovery to be made of great importance, and proved to the satisfaction of very many scholars and divines, and that such discovery militates against some of the Articles. What is the duty of a Clergyman? what of the Court? Is the Clergyman at liberty to use such discoveries so as advisedly to maintain what is repugnant to the Articles? I apprehend, certainly not. Is the Court to discuss whether the discovery be a real or true discovery, to define its effect and operation? The Court can do no such thing; it has only to administer the law. The duty of the Court is to shut its ears to all such discoveries. It is bound by law so to do. The law must be obeyed, even in what may be termed most extravagant circumstances. The Court of Queen's Bench proclaimed and adhered to that principle in the case of Ashford *v.* Thornton (1 B. and Ald. 460), where wager of Battel was demanded. Assuming the possibility of such discoveries as I have supposed, the consequence may arise, that discussions, by the Clergy, leading to truth, may be excluded; but if such should indeed be the case, and if it should

be deemed to need redress, recourse must be had to the highest authorities, viz. the Legislature, which established the Articles and Book of Common Prayer."—Pp. 7, 8.

Dr. Williams, while he admires his Judge's courage in accepting consequences as creditable to the logical precision of his intellect, offers a hint respecting the moral inconvenience of the supposed discrepancy between the profession and belief of a person in orders, and rather wonders that the ethical consequences of the discrepancy contained nothing to shock the lawyer in supporting the majesty of law.

We know not what impression this portion of the Judgment of the Dean of Arches will make on the general clerical mind of England; but regarding it as the latest and, until overruled by the decision of a higher Court, as the most authoritative statement of the position of the ministers of the Established Church, we cannot but regard it as humiliating, and a confirmation of the accuracy of the legal as well as moral judgment of our own great Milton in declining to take orders because he was not willing to "subscribe slave." With this sentence of the Judgment in his memory, no member of the Church of England can consistently make it matter of accusation against the Church of Rome that it compelled Galileo to retract his belief in the doctrine of the motion of the earth round the sun. There may be alleged technical differences between the case of the philosopher in his relations to the Church of Rome and those of a clergyman to the Church of England, but the spirit in both Churches is alike; authority in each is made superior to evidence and truth. If there were were no other obstacle to serving at the altars of an Established Church, we can well understand that a dictum like this of the Dean of Arches is sufficient barrier to a truth-loving and truth-speaking man to prevent his taking orders.

On the subject of open questions in theology, Dr. Lushington follows and confirms the decision in the Gorham case, that all theological doctrines not determined by the Articles or Liturgy are open questions.

Another passage in the Judgment is of great interest at the present time, when the subject of subscription is widely agitated both in and out of the pale of the Church.

"With regard to the meaning of the Act of Subscription to the Articles, I have no hesitation in declaring my opinion that the Subscription is a most solemn act, and that though the Court cannot take cognizance of the intentions of a Clergyman when he subscribes them, yet the law will hold him to have taken the obligation *secundum animum imponentis;* and that mind is the plain grammatical sense of the Articles themselves. The subscription to such Articles is a declaration by the subscriber of his conviction in their truth, and a promise to abide by them."—P. 11.

If Dr. Lushington be right, as we believe he is, it is manifest

that all who reduce the significance of subscription by clergymen to a willingness to use the Book of Common Prayer, or even to a general assent to it as containing on the whole true and scriptural doctrine, if they are not guilty of a moral perversion, at least fall into a very serious error of judgment. If this one paragraph in the Judgment could be brought home to the intellect and conscience of the clergy, it ought to suffice to awaken an earnest and general desire to have the shackles of subscription at least loosened.

If the philosophy of clerical subscription be as now declared by a high ecclesiastical legal authority, not merely the writers of Essays and Reviews, and all who sympathize with their latitudinarian views, but all, whether of the High-church or the Evangelical school, who disbelieve any one of the Articles or stumble at any part of the services of the Church, ought to feel themselves debarred from subscription, or, what is the same thing, continuing to hold a benefice, to which subscription is a necessary preliminary condition. It was a view of the moral force of subscription similar to that now propounded by Dr. Lushington, which in 1662 influenced most of the Two Thousand confessors of St. Bartholomew's-day. There were not wanting then and afterwards prelates disposed to extenuate the force of subscription, and to allure clergymen whom they esteemed into continued allegiance to the Church; but the stern honesty of those conscientious men forbade, though at the cost of their dearest interests, their accepting any lax or non-natural interpretations of the act of subscription. The Dean of Arches now virtually says that those confessors were right, legally and morally, in regarding subscription as *a most solemn act.*

Some of the articles filed against Dr. Williams alleged that the doctrines propounded by him were adverse to those of the Bible. Into the consideration of these articles Dr. Lushington declines to enter, on the ground that the Articles of Religion and the Formularies, not the Scriptures, are the standard of the judgment of the Court; and for the same reason he declines to accept arguments in defence alleged on the authority of the Bible.

The Dean of Arches quotes the judgment of the Judicial Committee in the Heath case as his authority on this point, and then adds these reasons of his own:

"Were I once to be tempted from the Articles and other parts of the Formularies, the Court could assign no limit to its investigations; it would inevitably be compelled to consider theological questions, not for the purpose of deciding whether they were conformable to a prescribed standard, but whether the positions maintained were reconcilable with Scripture or not. Against pursuing such a course as this, the reasons are many, and in my judgment overwhelmingly strong. The exercise of such power, even when it has been demanded on behalf of the accused Clergyman, has been hitherto repudiated, and especially by the Judicial

Committee, the highest Court which can exercise Ecclesiastical jurisdiction. A further consequence would be, that, instead of all questions of doctrine not contrary to the Articles of Religion and the Formularies being what are termed open questions, the Court would have to compare what is impugned—a Sermon or Essay—by numberless references to various parts of Scripture. How unsatisfactory would such an investigation be to the Clergy and people of this realm! What confusion would be introduced by the diverse opinions of Ecclesiastical Judges! What mistakes would necessarily arise! Into what a state of uncertainty would the Clergy of our Church be plunged!

"Pressed by these reasons, and urged by every motive to preserve peace in the Church, I will not be tempted, in the trial of any accusation against a Clergyman, to resort to Scripture as the standard by which the doctrine shall be measured; and I may with perfect truth add, that, were such a task imposed upon me, the want of theological knowledge would incapacitate me from adequately discharging it."—Pp. 12, 13.

But are we wrong in thinking that the reasons adduced by the Dean of Arches lead to a larger conclusion than that for which he adduces them? Admitting as we do the truth of his reasons, they seem to us to prove the inexpediency and danger of submitting theological opinions to the censure of any Court, whether the standard of judgment prescribed to it be simple or complex. The difficulties of the subjects on which theology treats, the natural varieties of the human mind, the bias, often unperceived but very potent, of prejudice, the obscurity and imperfections of language, and the absence of any generally recognized standard for the interpretation of terms occurring in theological controversy,—all these considerations are weighty against all theological courts of conscience. As it is, are there not on record "diverse opinions of ecclesiastical judges"? Are not the clergy already, on some questions, plunged into "a state of uncertainty"? The notorious theological divisions of the clergy, not merely on what are regarded as the open questions of the Church, but on matters spoken to by the Articles or involved in the Formularies, rebuke the hope of attaining that uniformity for which Acts of Parliament were passed and ecclesiastical courts gifted with their various functions and powers.

And we may at this point take notice of some of Dr. Rowland Williams's criticisms, in his Postscript, on his Judge and on ecclesiastical courts generally. He admits (we think he scarcely could deny) his Judge's "intentional fairness and desire to do right;" also his vigorous intellectual grasp, certainly very remarkable in an octogenarian; but he allows himself to question Dr. Lushington's official freedom from a prepossession of an episcopal orthodoxy, and his possessing the required knowledge of theological terms and modes of thought, and of the many-sided aspects belonging to positions in theology. It is also charged upon the Dean of Arches that he did not, as he should have done, censure the prosecuting Bishop where he was pro-

nounced to have "sinned against the formularies of the Church of England." How pungently Dr. Rowland Williams can criticise both his Bishop and his Judge, let the following passage, taken from his Postscript, shew:

"Beyond controversy, our Church ascribes instrumentality to the Sacrament of Baptism, but significance to water as its symbol. A Bishop with little learning and a mediæval leaning, falls into the hands of partisans, and attempts to make a clergyman assign to the symbolical water that instrumentality which belongs to the service, with all its aggregate of divine promise, human devotion, and faith. If ever there was a case, in which an unrepealed statute of Henry VIII., imposing exemplary damages for unjust prosecution, might have been enforced, this was one. The Court, engrossed apparently with its preconceived idea, that the only business before it was examination of the guilt of a presumed offender, contented itself with rejecting this indictment, but imposed no penalty on its framers."—Pp. 54, 55.

Of ecclesiastical courts generally the Vicar of Broadchalk writes with no more reverence than when he is handling his unlearned mediæval Diocesan.

"It was said, by no less a loyalist than Lord Clarendon, that no man ever had to do with an ecclesiastical court, but he found in it more delay and less justice, than in any civil court in the realm. As it was in the days of Clarendon, so is it now; so it will continue, until a species of judicature, formed for a different stage of society, be placed on a level with the rest of our institutions. If the modern reading of 'benefit of clergy' means, that we may be treated as felons, whenever we have a Tractarian bishop, or one who does not know the passages in Eusebius on the Canon, it is time that in theology, as in treason, a judge should enunciate legal principles, and a jury try questions of fact. Twelve sworn men, with two barristers and a judge of assize, would administer more justice in a week, than an ecclesiastical court in a year."—P. 63.

We have no intention of vindicating our ecclesiastical courts; they are, from the very theory of the Church of which they are the instruments, imperfect and unsatisfactory, seeking neither absolute truth nor agreement with scripture; but we doubt whether Dr. Rowland Williams has done justice either to the Judgment which he criticises or the learned and admirable lawyer by whom it was pronounced. To realize to ourselves the moderation and good sense which temper the decisions of the Dean of Arches, let us fancy, in contrast, the terms in which Convocation, had it taken synodical action on Essays and Reviews in general, or Dr. Rowland Williams' Essay in particular, would have denounced him and them. How would that reverend assembly flout the theory of open questions, and how vehement would its denunciations have been of the heresies advocated in Essays and Reviews touching the authority of the letter of holy writ! Nor are we disposed to think that it would be a pure gain to truth and scripture if theological controversies could be introduced into our assize courts, and submitted to the wisdom and fairness of a

judge and jury. The "twelve sworn men" might consist of butchers, graziers and somnolent farmers. Think of such topics as baptismal regeneration, prevenient grace or the five points, being submitted to men whose talk is of oxen and whose subtlest lore is on a Turnpike Act, whose acumen is barely equal to discuss a parochial rate! Again, we have no desire to disparage the purity of the ermine, but we must say we have no desire to hear our Judges talk theology. The specimens of biblical knowledge and theological astuteness which have sometimes been given from the Bench, in passing sentence on a capital felon or in testing the adequate faith and orthodoxy of a witness, have not inspired us with much confidence in judicial theology. Unitarians did not feel their respect for the Judges increased by the language of Vice-Chancellor Shadwell or Baron Alderson, when those learned and estimable men were handling the profoundly difficult points involved in the suit of the Attorney-General *versus* Shore. We cannot therefore accept Dr. Rowland Williams's suggestion of submitting controverted points in theology, or the orthodoxy of this or that rector or professor, to the ungenial arena of a court of assize.

On four points the judgment of the Dean of Arches is unfavourable to Dr. Williams. The first relates to the inspiration of scripture. Dr. Williams had spoken of the Bible as "an expression of devout reason." This the Judge holds to be inconsistent with the doctrine that it was written by the interposition of God.

"It has been said that the Church has not in these Articles or elsewhere defined inspiration. It is no part of my duty to define it, and I shall not attempt to do so; but I must put a construction upon the Articles, and I hold that in the phrases 'God's Word written' and the 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation' is necessarily implied the doctrine that in all matters necessary for salvation the Holy Scriptures emanated from the extraordinary and preternatural interposition of the Almighty,—the special mode and limit unknown to man. It is true that all good gifts spring from the same source—from the power and will of the Almighty; but the gifts of genius or of mental power, even in a greater degree than is common, the gifts of any faculty of mind or body in unusual excellence, the existence of these qualities in the highest perfection overleaps not the ordinary course of human affairs, and is plainly to be distinguished from the special interposition of God, which is necessarily implied in these Articles as the cause and origin of the Scriptures. I must hold therefore that any Clergyman who advisedly maintains, whether in direct or indirect language, that the Holy Scriptures proceed from the same mental powers as have produced other works, or *vice versâ*, even with the qualification that these powers in the one case and the other differ in degree, impairs the Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, does in fact maintain that the Bible is not God's Word written, but is the work of man, and thereby contravenes the Sixth and Twentieth Articles of Religion."—Pp. 15, 16.

Dr. Williams explains in his Postscript that the words ob-

jected to ("an expression of devout reason") occurred in an exposition of Bunsen's views, and proceeds:

"The German word is '*vernünftig*,' but is sometimes varied. The original writer meant by it that consistency with reason, and need of reasonable interpretation, which, in antagonism to the ecclesiastical courtiers of Prussia, he required with iteration. If I understand him aright, the antithesis to his sentiment would not be divinely revealed, but irrational. He is not excluding, as I conceive, Revelation, but folly. The acceptance by the Court of Arches of the indictment here proceeds not only upon the harshest construction of the German author's language, but upon the double assumption that I must have understood him in the harshest sense, and adopted that sense as my own."—P. 57.

Another phrase used by Dr. Williams, which the Court regarded as embodying a denial of the divine inspiration of scripture, was that in which he styles scripture as "before all things the voice of the Church."

Dr. Williams objects to his Judge's interpretation of the word Church, and also to his supposed doctrine denying the gifts of the Holy Spirit to the Church of to-day.

"A lawyer, sitting as our Primate's representative in Court, may be pardoned for understanding by the Church that respectable community which enjoys by Act of Parliament certain privileges; but to the theologian trained to meditate on things in their essence, the Church of God is that assembly of faithful men, which, from Abraham and St. Paul, has contained Prophet, Psalmist, Apostle, men of God speaking as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. A thousand questions may suggest themselves, as to manner, limits, variations in dialect, of thought, or speech, and expression of the Eternal in the finite; but that before all things the phenomenal character of our Bible is its procession through or from this company of faithful men, is so far from an indictable heresy, that most persons on reflection will call it a truism. If the Holy Ghost had not spoken by Isaiah and St. John, their works could not be inspired. I suppose no one deliberately doubts this. We ought not to blame a lawyer for his misinterpretation of a simple, however pregnant, truth, so much as the system which thrusts upon him an uncongenial task."—Pp. 55, 56.

Dr. Williams denies that the doctrine of the Church of England forbids the belief that men are now supernaturally illuminated; and hints that his Judge's sentence rejects the most hopeful solution on the side of Christianity of some of the great difficulties of revelation.

The language of Dr. Williams on the subject of justification by faith, in which he represents it as "the peace of mind or sense of Divine approval which comes of trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer," is adjudged by the Court to be in contradiction to that Article of Religion (the 11th) which treats of the justification of man.

This is Dr. Williams's explanation:

"Had I been framing a statement of my own doctrine, and not a

report of that of another man, I might possibly have written, 'Justification by faith is a doctrine in the Christian scheme which thus far corresponds to the principle of moral self-responsibility in ethics; both place the soul in direct relations with its Maker, and the one stands to ecclesiastical arrangements, as the other stands to legislative.'"—P. 61.

We think his explanation of Baron Bunsen more successful than his own comment on his own text.

Dr. Williams had described Propitiation as "the recovery of that peace which cannot be while sin divides us from the Searcher of hearts;" Regeneration he had spoken of as a corresponding giving of insight, or an awakening of the forces of the soul; the word Resurrection he had explained as a spiritual quickening; and Salvation as our deliverance, not from the life-giving God, but from evil and darkness. Dr. Lushington decides that Dr. Williams had ascribed to these terms, which embody leading doctrines of the Church, a novel interpretation, and one inconsistent with the 31st Article.

On this point, if we understand Dr. Rowland Williams aright, he maintains that he is censured not for his own opinions, but for giving an account of "a philosophical Lutheran's views on Justification and Propitiation," and intimates that his account had been "accompanied by a clear disclaimer of all the non-Anglican doctrines of the author reviewed." The difficulty in the mind of the Judge we suppose was, that while the assertion of adherence to Anglican views was general, the assertion of the heretical doctrine was very precise, and was so unaccompanied by a particular disclaimer as to leave the reader in the dark as to the author's opinion. This is one of the points in the Judgment on which a different decision might have been given, if the Judge had allowed greater weight to the fact of the Essay being in truth an account of the doctrines held by another.

We give in Dr. Williams's words his censure of the Judgment on the four points whereon the articles against him are admitted.

"The miscarriage of justice in these four points may be explained, with no great discourtesy, if we observe that the aspect under which Revelation presents itself to the legal mind is not as saving souls, but as material for framing Articles; and that a doctrinal contradiction thus technically elicited need not be a negation of any truth, but such a variation of tone or aspect, as may admit of being harshly construed into a studied discrepancy. I must confess myself to have looked in vain through the judgment for any recognition of the manifold depth of theological truth, or of that function of the scholar, which handles impartially all monuments of antiquity, without perverting in favour of any Church that by which all Churches profit in turn. Probably not one of the subjects which first entered into the discussion is caught in the judgment at the point of view at which it must have presented itself to either one of the original disputants. With no literary light, there could be no ecclesiastical justice."—P. 62.

For brevity's sake, we omit various points in the Judgment on

which the Dean of Arches pronounces against the admissibility of the articles and practically in favour of Dr. Rowland Williams. This part of the case might, however, suggest some curious reflections.

We must confess that on one material point, the latest publication of Dr. Williams disappoints us. It gives us no clear light as to his future intended course. He tells us that his counsel will best teach him how legal fictions are to be met; and that if he were technically to withdraw every expression reserved by the Court in the sense which the Court has technically affixed to it, he should not thereby retract a particle of his meaning or imply any modification of opinion. We have no fellow-feeling with Dr. Williams when he claims a triumph for himself and his principles in that portion of the Judgment which excluded scripture from the indictment. It was upon no broad principle of the right of private judgment, but by a mere technicality, that the Judge excluded scripture from the materials of his Judgment. For while he asserted that his Court only recognized the Articles of Religion and the Formularies, it is surely a needful preliminary on the part of a clergyman, before he assents to those Articles and Formularies, to ascertain that they are consistent with scripture and with truth.

There are passages in his sermon pitched in a higher key, one in particular at p. 44, where he alludes to the possible necessity that might be imposed upon him of following "*where God leads into the wilderness*" (of Nonconformity ?), and of gathering together two or three in Christ's spirit, and worshiping the living God in the freedom of the soul.

Yet in another passage of his sermon he intimates that he has "instructed his counsel to submit to the correction of the Court all doctrinal statements."

This will be a very lame conclusion of a painfully interesting controversy, and, if such be the issue of this prosecution, neither Dr. Rowland Williams nor the Church of England will have reason to look upon the issue with complacency. Dr. Williams, in a glowing passage of his sermon, speaks of some of the nobler heroes of Welsh Nonconformity as his prototypes. Those servants of God suffered, as he intimates, bravely from ecclesiastical policy. He adds,

"Their names live in the mindful tradition of our true-hearted race; and the successors of those who cast them out, now build their tombs. So it may be again. I have written some things, with a vision as of a far time, as a protest in the ears of them that shall be hereafter; knowing there was no audience for me in high places now."—P. 45.

Time will shew us whether the name of Rowland Williams will live in the reverence of the friends of liberty and truth, or whether he will add to the long and melancholy list of men who saw truth and loved it, but loved the world and its honours more.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Memories and Hopes. A Discourse preached at the Closing of the Old Chapel, Rosslyn Hill, Hampstead, on Sunday, June 1, 1862. By Thomas Sadler, Ph.D. London—Whitfield.

Few of our ministers have such ground for comfortable congregational memories and cheering hopes as Dr. Sadler, who has succeeded in raising the congregation at Hampstead from the slough of despond to an enviable eminence. The closing services now published are every way worthy of the occasion.

"We are here," said the preacher, "to bring for the last time our regular Sunday offerings—and many recollections and associations crowd upon our thoughts. The mists of the past rise and cause it to blend with the present; out of the old days and from the invisible world, the shadowy forms of the loved and honoured seem to hover about us; 'the stone cries out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber answers it;' in short, we have those feelings, with which alone it would be fitting and natural to close a long and interesting chapter of our history as a Christian church."—P. 5.

In the Sermon and in an Appendix we have a sketch of the history of the chapel, with the substance of which we propose to enrich our pages. Of the history of religion in Hampstead before the foundation of the chapel, Dr. Sadler professes not to give an account. It is in truth a subject enveloped in obscurity. That the religious teaching at Hampstead in the Commonwealth time and previously was of a Puritan character, is tolerably certain. As early as 1633, the minister of Hampstead was John Sprint, son of the more celebrated Puritan minister of the same name, who was author of *Cassander Anglicus* (1618). Calamy has mistakenly included the name of John Sprint among the ministers ejected in 1662. The register of Hampstead chapel records the burial of the minister, Oct. 19, 1658. Samuel, the brother of John Sprint, was one of the ejected clergy, quitting the rectory of South Tidworth, in Hampshire, on the passing of the Act of Uniformity, notwithstanding the great efforts made by Bishop Morley to induce him to remain in the Church. Of the Hampstead minister, who probably shared the opinions of his brother respecting Church matters, Calamy gives this testimony: "He was a man well reputed of both for his doctrine and life." Notice is taken of a petition of his, referred in 1643 to the "Committee for Plundered Ministers." Among the inhabitants during John Sprint's ministry was the illustrious Sir Harry Vane. It was at his mansion at Hampstead that he was arrested prior to his trial and exécution.

We now follow the account which Dr. Sadler gives, either in the text of his Sermon or in the Appendix.

"It is generally believed that this congregation dates back to near the time of the ejection of the Two Thousand Ministers; but our early records are I fear irrecoverably lost. We know that a Mr. Woodcock, the son of one of the ejected ministers, preached here for many years, but by whom he was preceded we have no information. The perfectly unrestrained manner in which the congregation has availed itself of what it deemed progress in religious thought and opinion is however to my mind a sufficient indication of the time of its origin. It has been said that the majority of the Two Thousand did not fully understand the bearings of religious freedom; but they did

more, they exemplified the fact that, without it, learned, thoughtful, and godly men would often have to pay a heavy penalty for growth in knowledge and for faithfulness to conscience. The principle of religious liberty certainly ought not to be less prized by us because the conviction of its necessity did not originate in a theory, but was first *felt* in the path of enlightened duty." Pp. 5, 6.

"The first minister whom we can distinctly trace is Mr. Thomas Woodcock. He held that office for many years, and probably was the writer of a MS. sermon, which, by the kindness of the Rev. R. B. Aspland, now lies before me. It is dated July 21st, 1695, Hampstead, and is evidently the work of an able and learned man. The text is James v. 12. Mr. Woodcock's father, a man of considerable attainments and power, was ejected from St. Andrew Undershaft, and was brother to Captain Woodcock, whose daughter Catherine became Milton's second wife—his 'late espoused saint,' in whose person

'Love, sweetness, goodness shined
So clear, as in no face with more delight.'

Thomas Woodcock the elder spent some time at Leyden, for the education of his sons."—P. 18.

"Mr. Woodcock was succeeded by a man of considerable eminence, Zechariah Merrell, who, amongst other works, 'wrote the Exposition of the first Ep. of St. Peter in continuation of Matthew Henry's celebrated Commentary,' and who was one of the original trustees under the will of Dr. Daniel Williams, founder of the well-known library now in Red-Cross Street."—P. 6.

Of Mr. Merrell, Dr. Sadler adds that "he was a man of distinguished ability and piety, and that he published several single sermons."

"About two years before the death of Mr. Merrell, which occurred in 1732, Mr. John Partington took charge of the congregation. He is described by Wilson as a Scotchman. But he was connected with the Cheshire Classis, was ordained by it in 1722, and preached before it after his settlement in London. He came to Hampstead from Coventry, where he had ministered for six years. In 1738, he removed to the Scotch Church, Founder's Hall, Lothbury.

"In Mr. Wilson's account there is a chasm between the years 1738 and 1765, which I am enabled to fill up from other sources. In 1739, Mr. Joseph Simmons was minister. His death took place in 1754, but in 1753 Mr. Walton was preaching. The next name I find is that of Mr. Robert Atkinson, from Coventry, who, however, did not remain long, for in 1757 the pulpit was vacant. In 1758, Mr. Richard Gardner, a pupil of Dr. Doddridge, accepted the pastorship. He removed in 1765, and was succeeded by Mr. Richard Amner, from Yarmouth, whose varied publications bear ample testimony to his attainments, particularly on subjects connected with theology and biblical criticism. He left in 1777, to settle at Cosely, but afterwards took up his residence at Hinckley, his native place."—Pp. 18, 19.

Of Mr. Richard Amner, a biographical account will be found in Nichols's History of Leicestershire. He must have left Hampstead, Dr. Sadler states,

"As early as the year 1777. A member of this congregation, who died only a year before I entered on my ministry here, could well recollect the great pleasure with which she listened to Mr. Amner, of whom she said that 'he was an Arian and regarded as the most liberal preacher of his day.'"—P. 6.

"The minister who followed was Mr. Lionel Brown, who resigned in 1780.

"In 1782, Mr. Edward Gibson left Daventry Academy, and accepted the invitation of the Hampstead congregation. His stay, however, was short, for in 1785 he went as minister to Stannington, near Sheffield, and afterwards to Stockport. Whether he remained at Hampstead even these three years,

seems doubtful, for I find this record in the Minutes of the Body of Presbyterian Ministers in and near the cities of London and Westminster: 'April 5th, 1785, Revd. Mr. Fuller has left the congregation at Hampstead.'

"Mr. Fuller came to London from Enfield, and was assistant minister to the Rev. Thomas Tayler, at Little Carter Lane Chapel, from 1778 to 1783. In 1787, the Rev. Rochemont Barbauld settled at Hampstead, and remained till 1802, when he became minister at Newington Green, and was succeeded by Mr. Methuen, who received his education in Scotland. Mr. Methuen's death took place in 1815, and the Rev. Jeremiah Joyce, author of the 'Scientific Dialogues,' preached his funeral sermon, and entered into his labours for about twelve months, when he followed him to the grave.

"For a short time Mr. Shiel, a Scotchman, occupied the pulpit, but in 1819 he returned to his own country.

"The next minister was the Rev. Samuel Catlow, from Mansfield. He died in 1820.

"From this time, the services were conducted by students from the General Baptist Academy, under the Rev. J. Gilchrist, of Newington Green, till the beginning of 1824, when the Rev. William Wilson, from Crewkerne, became the minister. In 1829, he removed to Newbury, and was succeeded by the Rev. G. Kenrick, who resigned after a ministry of sixteen years.

"The present minister entered upon his office at Midsummer, 1846."—Pp. 19, 20.

"With regard to the original meeting-house, we are very much in the dark. In an account of Hampstead written in 1813, it is stated that the chapel in which the congregation then met was said to have been built by Mr. Isaac Honeywood, who inhabited the adjoining house, and who died there in 1740. Subsequently a stone was found with 1736 inscribed on it, in which year it is supposed a rebuilding took place. At this time there was in all probability a numerous assembly of worshippers. There were upwards of 70 English Presbyterian ministers in and near the cities of London and Westminster, and they and their congregations exercised great social influence. It has been often deplored that there should have been so large a falling off in numbers as there has been since then; but I think we should look on this as a sign of the severity of the battle in which our fathers were engaged; and if I am asked whether or not they have been successful, I shall not make a numerical calculation, but consider whether there has been an advance of the principles which they upheld. If the day should come when those enlarged and liberal principles shall be generally adopted by thoughtful and earnest Christians, we may well be reconciled to the thinning of our ranks in the attainment of such a victory for charity and truth. It is no new thing to find that the regiments which bear the brunt of a noble fight, have at the end to lament the fewness of those who remain. We must remember that, with scarcely any exceptions, those congregations which were left free, embraced by degrees opinions which they themselves had deemed erroneous on matters of vital importance: hence over many persons came a spirit of fear; they said, we have been in favour of liberty, but we did not think it would lead to this, and they made their retreat to what they deemed a safer position. It is one thing to uphold the freedom which covers a progressive theology of our own, but another to maintain the freedom which enables others to make as they think advances beyond ourselves, that is, absolute religious liberty as a human necessity and right, and as the atmosphere most favourable to the growth of the Christian spirit and the coming of the kingdom of God."—Pp. 7, 8.

Isaac Honeywood, whose name is connected with the old chapel, was related to the Kentish family of that name. The Hampstead estate passed, on the death of Frazer Honeywood, of London, Banker, to Sir John Honeywood, the third Baronet. Except in the case of Isaac

Honeywood, who built the Hampstead chapel, we have no knowledge of any connection of this family with the Nonconformist party.

Dr. Sadler alludes with much taste and feeling to various incidents and associations connected with the last sixty years' history of the little congregation at Hampstead:

"Hampstead is a country village separated from the metropolis by miles of fields, with lonely places, in which sometimes the highwaymen would hide. In the minister's diary it is stated on various occasions that he set out for London, but had to turn back on account of the state of the roads. It is Sunday morning, and we are in a plain old English Presbyterian meeting-house. A quieter place for spending holy-day could hardly anywhere be found. If we had the names of all the worshippers, it would not take long to read them over, but two at least are known far and wide, and rank among the best writers of their time—and both are sweet singers of immortal verse; I need scarcely say I refer to Mrs. Barbauld and Mrs. Joanna Baillie. But I rejoice in finding them here far less on account of their great eminence, than on account of their singularly pure and lofty moral principle, and deep and fervent religious feeling. It is pleasant to think of religious services in which their spirits took part.

"Time goes on and saps the foundation of the walls; they must be rebuilt, but they may be brought closer together now; much space is no longer required. Accordingly in 1828 a new and small chapel was erected on the site of the old. Still there is room and to spare. A record says, 'Five persons present to-day.' Would the worship have to be discontinued? Many of the English Presbyterian congregations had already ceased to exist; would not this share their fate? A very few, principally 'honourable women,' took the question seriously to heart, and made up by zeal what was wanting in numbers. One, who left a substantial proof of her interest, would often in the wanderings of her last illness dream that she was multiplying her gifts, in order that the services in the chapel might be kept up.

"How the mighty city crept on and on till the lurking-places of the highwayman disappeared, and the roads were lined and the fields covered with houses—how our little sanctuary began to look not quite so desolate—how it became full—how in our gladness we pondered whether it were not better to keep our full small building than to run the risk of one larger not so full—how we had faith and added a third in length, and said 'this will do for our time'—how the subject of enlarging presented itself again, and, after the same misgivings as before, we had faith, and added a third in width—how we came upon the foundation of the building as it was before it was made less—how still after a few years we had not room enough, and some of us felt strongly that as a Christian Church we were not doing our duty, and not a few were willing and anxious to form themselves into a staff of workers—I need not here recite; but 'when I remember these things,' and when I think that we are here as worshippers for the last time, 'I pour out my soul in me: for I had gone with the multitude, I went with them to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, with a multitude that kept holy-day.'" Pp. 8—11.

Dr. Sadler, in alluding to his own ministrations, says, "The subject which has been chiefly dwelt on here is the central truth of Christianity, the fatherly character of God, as revealed by and in Christ."

We conclude our extracts from this excellent Sermon by giving utterance to the hope that the able and zealous minister of the Rosslyn-Hill chapel, Hampstead, may long continue to preach this glorious doctrine, and that the congregation there may be in numbers and in Christian feeling and religious zeal all that their pastor would wish them to be.

The Quarterly Review. No. 223. July.

Of the eight articles which compose the current Quarterly, all are readable, and the greater number are instructive. But we have time and space only to notice the last in order, entitled "The Bicentenary." It is always to be regretted when a question involving matters of history is mixed up with modern polemics. What justice a *Quarterly* reviewer is likely to do to the clergy ejected from the Church of England in 1662, when his object is to throw discredit on the managers of the Liberation Society in 1862, will be sufficiently patent. There is no concealment on the part of the reviewer of his intolerant animus. His opening sentence shews it plainly. He there describes the sufferers as "Puritan partizans who paid the penalty of defeat by losing their spoil just 200 years ago."

The reviewer elsewhere speaks contemptuously of the Bicentenary movement, as though it were an outburst of religious zeal, selecting "*a false view of history as the channel for its expression.*" It may perhaps appear to dispassionate readers that these words describe the fault of the reviewer. It is sometimes the pleasure of clerical writers, when speaking of the struggles of religious parties in the 17th century, to represent the Puritans as for the most part mere fanatics, men without education or learning, weavers, handicrafts-men and the like, who had contrived by the turn of events to dispossess of their livings a learned clergy, and who, when the next turn in the political wheel came, were themselves dispossessed. That there were ignorant men occupying Church livings at the time of the Restoration is true, but their number was very small, perhaps not much greater than are to be found at present, when, by the aid of theological forcing-beds like St. Bees, Scripture readers are manufactured in a couple of years into curates. But it shews a lamentable disregard of history and biography when it is asserted or hinted that the bulk of the men who were put out by the Act of Uniformity were illiterate persons. The lives of the Two Thousand, as written by Calamy, shew that a very large portion of them were persons well known in the two universities, and that many of them were literary men and the authors of various works, especially in theology, held in repute both at home and abroad. It is an equal misrepresentation of the facts of the case to describe the persons on whose position and fortunes the Act of Uniformity took such disastrous effect, as men who had previously played the game of persecution successfully against the Episcopalian party, and in their turn only got what they had given. No candid writer will for a moment deny that the clergymen who in the Commonwealth time chose deprivation rather than violate conscience by subscribing the Covenant or the Engagement, are entitled to praise and honour. Nor can it be with truth denied that there were among the Two Thousand some who were intruders and had been persecutors. When, however, the advocate of the Church of England, for the sake of justifying the cruel policy of Clarendon and the Bishops in 1662, magnifies the number of the deprived clergy and represents them as amounting to six or even eight thousand, the improbability (to use no stronger term) of the statement is easily shewn. In an excellent Address spoken at St. James's Hall in the spring of the present year, Dr. Vaughan thus remarked on the numbers of the clergy alleged to have been sequestered previously to the Restoration:

"Mr. Walker spent some ten years in searching for information as to sequestered clergymen in the different dioceses of England. All accessible parties were put into motion to supply him with material. The utmost number of men that he could name after all is a little above 2,000 for the twenty years, and if that were so, you can see that there never could have been 6,000 expelled. But there is a briefer way of settling this point. If 6,000 were in the condition of sequestrated clergy in 1644, or subsequently, then, according to the laws of mortality, there must have been 3,600, and more, of those men alive in 1660, and claiming to be put back into their livings. All that were so living at that time were put back, and the whole number that were so restored did not appear to have amounted to more than some five or six hundred. The point, therefore, is settled by the most certain of tests. This is a course of inquiry which I have worked out for myself. But I would not rest satisfied with my own calculations. I have obtained the opinion of two of the first actuaries and staticians in this kingdom—one of them ought to be, from his position, the very first—and this is their statement:—If there were 6,000 men alive, of 24 years of age and upwards, in 1644, there ought to have been 3,600 of those men living in 1660; and the number of ejected ministers accordingly, between the spring of 1660 and the autumn of 1662, ought to have been between 5,000 and 6,000! I do hope, therefore, that we shall hear no more about these 6,000 sequestered clergymen. The truth is, sir, that we are greatly mistaken in supposing that the test applied to the Episcopal clergy in those times was so severe as it is said to have been."

This sounds like fair and valid historical criticism. But such a statement is anything but convenient to unsparing writers of the Church party. The Quarterly reviewer sets down the number of sequestered clergy as "variously computed from six to ten thousand," and asserts that "the vast majority of them perished miserably;" "only 600 lived to claim their rights when the King came back in 1660." In a note, the reviewer states Dr. Vaughan's criticism, which he admits to be "bold and ingenious," and replies to it in a conjecture which may be "bold," but is scarcely ingenious. Dr. V. appears to him "*to be wholly unaware of the tendency of starvation to shorten human life;*" and after quoting the opinions of the actuaries, adds sarcastically, "We hope that the next time he meets his friends the actuaries, he will tell them of the allegation which certain contemporaries have made, that the greater part of the said 6000 clergymen had little or nothing to eat during the interval in question. Perhaps they will inform him whether that circumstance would make any difference in the calculation of their probable vitality."

When an extreme position like that of the reviewer is taken, it would be well if its consequences were duly forecast. If such were the facts of the case, how little ground can there be for the confidence expressed by Church writers in the historical accuracy of Walker's "Sufferings of the Clergy," a work of which the editor of the "Annals of England" has just put out a mutilated edition, as a fitting offering on the Church side to Bicentenary literature. In a most slovenly manner must Walker have done his work, when he has enumerated little more than a third (if so many) of the numbers sequestered. But what were the numerous clergymen who still enjoyed their livings and gentlemen and lords doing, who sympathized with the sequestered clergy, yet permitted more than 5000 of them to die of starvation? The sequestered clergy had their fifths. The ejected Nonconformists had nothing reserved, but, depending on their own honest industry or the charity of those who sympa-

thized with them, were yet preserved from actual want. The reviewer will scarcely admit that the Episcopalians were less attached to their ministers than the poor Nonconformists were, or that the charity of Churchmen was lax and cold compared with that of their Puritan opponents.

The Quarterly reviewer treats the celebration of this anniversary year as simply a piece of anti-state-church machinery. He regards the sentiment towards the ejected as so much stage talk got up for an effect and a purpose. But surely the reviewer must know that admiration of the virtue of the ejected clergy is neither a novel sentiment nor one confined to Dissenters. What said the impartial Hallam?

"When the day of St. Bartholomew came, about 2,000 persons resigned their preferments rather than stain their consciences by compliance,—an act to which the more liberal Anglicans, after the bitterness of immediate passions had passed away, have accorded that praise which is due to heroic virtue in an enemy."

The late Archdeacon Hare, speaking of the ejected clergy, said:

"How grievous was the wound to the Church at the time! How grievous is it still at this day in its enduring effects! Two thousand ministers, comprising the chief part, it seems scarcely questionable, of the most faithful and zealous of the land, were silenced in one day, were severed in one day from their flocks, were cast in one day out of our Church, for the sake of maintaining uniformity!"

The Quarterly reviewer makes it a crime on the part of the Independents that they join in a cry for the abolition of the Act of Uniformity. True, their principles would prevent their benefiting by a State Church, however wide its doors were thrown open; but surely any man with a conscience and a love of integrity may wish to see the clergy of another communion relieved from a burthen and delivered from a snare. Independents have learnt from such teachers as Archdeacon Hare, that the Act of Uniformity was "most disastrous, most tyrannical and schismatical"—"the authors of which, it is plain, were not seeking unity, but division." The greater the charity and the virtue of those who would better a Church and assist its ministers, though they are themselves precluded from joining it.

For Lord Ebury and his attempts at comprehension and the reform of the Liturgy, the reviewer has no more a word of blessing than for Mr. Miall and Dr. Forster. The argument largely insisted on by the reviewer is the old one of fear: If you begin concession and reform, you will not know where to stop. Our readers will be at least amused with one or two passages in which the position, aims and prospects of the "Socinians" and "Unitarians" are alluded to.

"There is a motley throng of religionists crowding outside the door of the Church, anxious to force their way in, in order to divide the treasure which is stored inside. As long as the door is kept shut, they cannot reach the smallest objects of plunder. They have made the effort recently with at first some prospect of success."

The "plunder" we suppose to be protection from rates to a Church in which the Dissenter does not worship, and from the creed of which he may widely dissent. When the writer of these lines, a few months ago, paid on compulsion a church-rate, he felt the process disagreeable, but had not the faintest suspicion that his wish to be relieved from such

an impost partook of the nature of "plunder." But the reviewer continues thus:

"But Lord Ebury has two or three friends among the throng outside whom he is very anxious to let in; and therefore he begs to be allowed to open the door just a very little. But he is extremely eager to convince the stern guardians of the door that it is only to be opened just ajar, and that the very moment his friends have slipped in it shall be securely closed again. *The only question is, whether the Socinians and other stalwart sectaries behind, who do not enjoy the advantage of Lord Ebury's friendship, will allow him to smuggle in his own friends, and then patiently stand perfectly still while he slams the door back in their faces.* Lord Ebury, whose simplicity is as confiding as his charity is amiable, believes that they will. We, who have the misfortune to take a gloomier view of mankind, have, on the contrary, an uneasy suspicion that they will not."

The reviewer proceeds to try and shake the nerves of Lord Ebury and other liberal Churchmen by holding out the imminent danger to the Church from the union of the Freethinkers in the Church with the Unitarians.

"The freethinkers, whom he would exclude, are strong in ability, in the influence they have gained with a certain section of the educated classes, and in the fact that as a school they are young, and have the promise of the future before them. *The Unitarians, with whom on such a question they would act, also possess a strength arising from social position and ability out of all proportion to their numbers.* They would never moot such a question of themselves; without assistance they would be powerless to force the defences of the Church of England."

The reviewer pleads for the retention of the present test because from its antiquity it has a power and a prestige which a new test would lack. He is probably not far from the truth when he assumes "that the construction of a new test is an impossibility. A *formula concordiæ* is always a perplexing instrument to construct." He supposes, so fond are the present clergy of narrowness and exclusion, that were an Act of comprehension passed, many whom he calls "the nobler spirits in the Church" would fly off to keep themselves at a distance from heresy. The reviewer draws a dark picture of the consequences to ensue were the Church deprived of that definite faith contained in her Articles and Prayer-book. There would be, he prophesies, disseminated in her name merely a mass of conflicting dogmas, breathing into the soul the ineradicable doubt whether Truth exists at all. But should not the reviewer see that, with its definite faith, the Church of England is already fulfilling in part his prophecy? What conflicting dogmas are disseminated by Puseyites here, by Evangelicals there—by an Arminian in this parish, and a fierce Calvinist in the next—by a high and dry Churchman at the head of one deanery, and a Latitudinarian in another! Is not the bad result he deprecates already accomplished? Do not Essays and Reviews and similar publications prove that ineradicable doubts on vital questions of faith have infused themselves into many minds? Is this acknowledged state of things mended by subscription to Articles which are not believed? Is scepticism alone an evil? It may be honest, compared with a hollow faith and an insincere profession of assent and consent.—We see that the *Saturday Review* has condescended to serve up to its readers the fictions of this Quarterly article, seasoned with its accustomed sauce of vitriol.

INTELLIGENCE.

EVENTS OF THE MONTH.

Anniversary Services at Swindon (Aug. 3).—The Rev. John Ellis, of Diss, after paying a visit to the Potteries to inspect the field of his future missionary labours, spent Sunday, Aug. 3, at Swindon, and preached to large and attentive congregations. The Lord's Supper was for the first time administered to the congregation, and of the communicants several were persons recovered by the services of the chapel and Mr. Young's pastoral influence from infidelity and vice. On the following Tuesday, 200 persons joined in celebrating the opening of the iron church of Mr. Young, by a social tea-party and a public meeting. Mr. Young seems to be doing a good work and to deserve the aid of the Unitarian public.

Pease-Hill Chapel, Nottingham (Aug. 5). The exertions made by our friends in Nottingham to promote the knowledge of their principles and extend Unitarian worship are highly creditable to them, and the success which seems to attend their efforts should be an encouragement to other like-minded societies to go and do likewise. A meeting was held in the chapel on Pease-Hill Road to give a welcome to the new minister, Rev. W. H. Quinn, late of Chatham, and to concert measures for the proper celebration of the approaching anniversary of St. Bartholomew's-day. The chair was ably filled by Mr. L. Heymann, who announced the resolution of the Unitarians of Nottingham to build a second chapel: three gentlemen had subscribed £750, the chapel-wardens offered £250, and about £500 had yet to be raised. Among the appropriate and powerful addresses of the evening, that of Rev. P. W. Clayden, giving a fraternal welcome to the new minister, was admirable for its heartiness and efficiency.

Southern Unitarian Society (Aug. 6). — The sermons were preached before this Society by Rev. J. Panton Ham, at Wareham. Rev. E. Kell read at the business meeting the report, which referred in earnest terms of respect to the character and services of the late Rev. Maxwell Davidson; also to a series of lectures which have been just delivered in the several pulpits in the district of the Society's operations in reference to the Bicentenary anniversary, and contained the usual statistical and other returns respecting the various congregations affiliated to the Society. The meeting subsequently passed resolutions on the subjects of the character of the late Mr. Davidson; on the inability of clergymen to separate themselves from holy orders; and on the Bicentenary Memorial Fund, of which it expressed hearty approval. Interesting speeches were delivered by the ministers present, and by Mr. E. W. Field, of London, and other friends.

Opening of Unity Church, Islington (Aug. 20).—This beautiful church, the architecture of which does high credit to the taste and skill of Mr. Thomas Chatfeild Clarke, and not less to the enterprize and munificent liberality of the congregation, was opened in the presence of a large number of worshipers with an afternoon religious service. The prayers were offered by Rev. Henry Ierson, the minister of the church, and the sermon was preached by Rev. T. Madge from Psalm c. 4. We are informed that both the prayers and the sermon were admirable expositions of Unitarian devotion and doctrine. A large and enthusiastic social meeting followed, at which addresses of great beauty and interest were spoken by Mr. Ierson, Mr. Alderman Lawrence, Rev. J. C. Means, Rev. J. P. Ham, Rev. Thos. Madge, and other friends. The earnest *Christian* spirit evinced on the occasion by the pastor of the church and his friends was very gratifying, and will, we trust, be responded to by thousands of the Unitarian body throughout the country. That manifestation is just now timely and important, when efforts are being industriously made by some influenced by a different spirit to hold up Theodore Parker as the expounder of Unitarianism. To the learning and genius of Theodore Parker we have always paid due respect; to his personal virtues we have always given admiration; but of his acceptance of Christianity as a system of *revealed* truth, we have never been able to see in his published works any satisfactory evidence. It is with regret we feel the necessity of making these remarks; but of this we feel assured, that if the more unreserved admirers of Theodore Parker succeed in their attempt to make the world believe that he is the accepted interpreter of the Unitarian faith, their success would lead to the entire alienation of many of the most estimable and earnest of our Unitarian friends from the denomination which they now adorn. But of such a lamentable result we entertain little apprehension.

OBITUARY.

In May, at Adelaide, South Australia, Mrs. Grace Craig, widow of Mr. John Craig, formerly of Glasgow, Scotland. Her husband was one of the most zealous founders of the Unitarian congregation in Adelaide, and she continued up to the Sunday before her death to be a sincere worshiper of one God the Father in the Unitarian church there, and was an exemplary Christian in every relation of life.—J. C. W.

June 24, at Birmingham, Mary Ann, the beloved wife of Mr. S. M. Sadleir, and for nearly twenty-five years an able and respected member of the Old meeting-house choir. Her punctuality of attendance, her fine voice and expressive style, and her readiness to assist in all charitable works, secured her many friends, who join her family in mourning her decease.

July 21, in London, in the 50th year of his age, Geo. Smith Brent, Esq., F.S.A., Deputy Coroner for the Western division of Middlesex.

July 23, at Chirton, near North Shields, Mr. Edward Simpson, aged 73. "The cause of popular progress and social reform (says the *Newcastle-on-Tyne Daily Chronicle*) has lost an earnest advocate in the north by the death of Mr. Edward Simpson. He had been known throughout the Northumberland districts as an earnest and zealous advocate of temperance for upwards of a quarter of a century, and for above a quarter of a century before that as an unflinching political reformer. Mr. Simpson was a Poor-Law Guardian for the Tynemouth Union for many years, and was a generous friend to the poor man, always leaning to mercy's side; and was also one of the Councillors of Tynemouth ward, in the North Shields corporation, four years. He had been a member of the Unitarian congregation in Newcastle fifty years, and was greatly respected by the congregation worshiping in the Church of the Divine Unity as a consistent and upright man in all the relations of life. His old neighbours and most of the people of Shields held the good old man in the highest esteem for his works' sake." His remains were interred by Rev. William Newton in North Shields Old Cemetery, when a large retinue, including the Mayor of Tynemouth, friends from Newcastle, Sunderland, &c., were present at the funeral.

July 23, at Bowdon, near Manchester, aged 3 years, Isabel Laura, youngest daughter of the late A. H. Paterson, Esq., M.D.

July 30, aged 15 weeks, Herbert Frank, infant son of Mr. Thomas D. Carpenter, of the Terrace, Hackney.

Aug. 4, at Rose Villa, Coseley, Hannah Grainger, in the 73rd year of her age.

Aug. 6, at Douglas, Isle of Man, in his 25th year, Alfred, eldest son of Thomas Thornely, Esq., of Oaklands, Godley, and grandson of the late Alexander Wylde Thornely, Esq., of Godley Vale, whose death was recorded in our last No.

MARRIAGES.

July 19, at Little Portland-Street chapel, by Rev. Thomas Madge, Richard, third son of the late Robert Roscoe, Esq., to Honora, younger daughter of Philip Worsley, Esq., of Taviton Street, London.

July 22, at the Unitarian church, New Hall Hill, Birmingham, by the father of the bride, John Alfred, son of the late John Jones, of Handsworth, to Alice, younger daughter of John Green, Esq., Fenelon Villa, Hagley Road, Edgbaston.

July 30, at the Presbyterian chapel, Ainsworth, near Bolton, by Rev. John Wright, B.A., Oswald Osmond, son of Thomas Wrigley, Esq., Timberhurst, near Bury, to Annie, daughter of the late Rev. James Whitehead.

Aug. 2, at the Earl-Street chapel, Maidstone, by Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, Mr. William Easton Ginner, of London, to Sarah, daughter of Mr. Samuel Bartlett, of Maidstone.

Aug. 4, at Rosslyn-Hill chapel, Hampstead, by Rev. Dr. Sadler, Edmund Burnard, eldest son of Rev. Henry Squire, of Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, to Florence, third daughter of the late Henry Bradshaw Fearon, Esq., of Frognal, Hampstead.

Aug. 21, at the Church of the Messiah, Birmingham, by Rev. Samuel Bache, Wm. James Russell, Esq., of London, to Fanny Follett, eldest daughter of A. Follett Osler, Esq., of South Bank, Edgbaston.